N080-630 ERIC REPORT RESUME

ED 010 041 9-08-66 24 (REV)

CONFERENCE ON QUALITY AND EQUALITY IN EDUCATION.

TUMIN, MELVIN M. * BRESSLER, MARVIN
TMW65892 PRINCETON UNIV., N.J.

CRP-F-048
- -66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.72 HC-$23.48 587P.

*EDUCATIONAL QUALITY, *EDUCATIONAL EQUALITY, *CONFERENCES, *EDUCATIONAL PLANNING, GROUP DYNAMICS, INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES, SOCIAL INFLUENCES, COMPENSATORY EDUCATION, EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES, LEARNING DIFFICULTIES, HIGHER EDUCATION, TEACHER RECRUITMENT, TEACHER EDUCATION, PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

A 3-DAY CONFERENCE WAS HELD AT PRINCETON UNIVERSITY TO DEFINE GOALS, IDENTIFY OBSTACLES, AND SUGGEST MEANS THROUGH WHICH SUPERIOR EDUCATION COULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO ALL AMERICANS REGARDLESS OF TALENT OR POSITION IN THE STRATIFICATION SYSTEM. SEVEN SESSIONS EMPHASIZED A WIDE RANGE OF FACTORS IN THE SCHOOL AND SOCIETY THAT INFLUENCE QUALITY AND EQUALITY IN EDUCATION. THE TOPICS OF THE CONFERENCE SESSIONS AS LISTED ON THE AGENDA WERE--(1) 'POLARITIES AND TENSIONS IN THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM,' (2) 'THE CHALLENGE OF GROUP DIFFERENCES,' (3) 'THE CHALLENGE OF INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES,' (4) 'EDUCATION IN THE SOCIAL SYSTEM (EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL INFLUENCES AFFECTING THE SCHOOL),' (5) 'THE CONTENT AND PROCESSES OF EDUCATION,' (6) 'THE RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING OF SCHOOLMEN,' AND (7) 'BEYOND THE TWELFTH YEAR (THE PROBLEM OF CONTINUING EDUCATION).'IT WAS CONCLUDED THAT THE OBSTACLES IN THE ACHIEVEMENT OF QUALITY AND EQUALITY IN EDUCATION SHOULD BE UNDERTAKEN AT TWO LEVELS--THE SOCIETAL AND THE EDUCATIONAL. THE FIRST OF THESE MODES OF INTERVENTION WOULD AIM AT ELIMINATING THOSE FEATURES OF SOCIETY THAT PRODUCE LEARNING DEFICITS IN CHILDREN BEFORE THEY ATTEND SCHOOL AND WHICH CONTINUE THROUGHOUT THEIR EDUCATION. THE SECOND MODE WOULD INCLUDE GREATER ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES TO THE EDUCATIONAL SECTOR AND THE ADOPTION OF COMPENSATORY DEVICES, SUCH AS PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS, SMALL CLASSES, AND INTENSIVE TUTORING. (JH)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

CONFERENCE ON "QUALITY AND EQUALITY IN EDUCATION"

Cooperative Research Project No. F-048

The Proceedings Edited
and with an Overview
by

Melvin M. Tumin and Marvin Bressler
Princeton University

__Theme Papers by__ and

Urie Bronfenbrenner
John C. Flanagan
Edgar Z. Friedenberg
Seymour E. Harris
Samuel A. Kirk
John W. Powell
Peter H. Rossi
Robert J. Schaefer
Harold Taylor
Robin M. Williams Jr.

__Discussions by__

Martin Deutsch
Miriam L. Goldberg
Louis M. Hacker
Sidney Hook
Herman H. Long
Martin Mayer
Fritz Redl
Milton Schwebel
Clarence Senior
Judson T. Shaplin
Samuel Shepard Jr.
Theodore R. Sizer
Martin Trow
Ernest van den Haag

1966

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This conference on Quality and Equality in Education could not have occurred at all without the Roger Williams Straus Council on Human Relations which sponsored it and the United States Office of Education which extended financial support. Dr. Fritz Ianni, then Acting Director of the Cooperative Research Program of the Office, Dr. Sydney S. Spivack, Research Associate of the Council, and Professor Lawrence Cremin, Teachers College, Columbia University, offered us the advantage of their judgment and experience in suggesting possible participants. Mrs. Cathy Greenblat is owed a special debt of gratitude for her invaluable help in the compilation of the annotated bibliography that appears at the end of this volume.

Charles L. Taggart of the Princeton University Conference disposed of the innumerable details of conference arrangements with unfailing efficiency and good humor. Mrs. Joan Levinson and Mrs. Joan Maruhnic, our secretaries, who from the very beginning of this project were virtually collaborators, managed to maintain their equilibrium as crisis succeeded crisis. Peter Stein, a graduate student in sociology, performed a number of crucial tasks with great resourcefulness and ingenuity.

Our chief debt is, of course, to the participants who despite the pressure of other duties spent three days and nights in Princeton bringing light and clarity to smoke-filled rooms. It is a great source of personal gratification that through this volume a wider audience will be witness to their deliberations.

M.T.

M.B.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements
Conference Participants 1 - 3
Introduction 1 - 18

Part I CONFERENCE SESSIONS

Session One

"Polarities and Tensions in the Educational System"

Introduction — James E. Allen, Jr. — i - ii
Theme Paper and Supplementary Comments — Harold Taylor — 1 - 13 c
Discussion — Sidney Hook — 14 - 20
Discussion — Martin Mayer — 21 - 30
Response — Harold Taylor — 31 - 38
Additional Queries and Responses — 39 - 53

Session Two

"The Challenge of Group Differences"

Introduction — John H. Martin — i - iv
Theme Paper and Supplementary Comments — Peter H. Rossi — 1 - 14 c
Discussion — Martin Deutsch — 15 - 22
Discussion — Martin Trow — 23 - 29
Response — Peter H. Rossi — 30 - 31
Additional Queries and Responses — 32 - 41

Session Three

"The Challenge of Individual Differences"

Introduction — Henry S. Dyer — i - iii
Theme Paper and Supplementary Comments — Samuel A. Kirk — 1 - 27 c
Discussion — Fritz Redl — 28 - 37
Discussion — Milton Schwebel — 38 - 44
Response — Samuel A. Kirk — 45 - 50
Additional Queries and Responses — 51 - 55

Session Four

"Education in the Social System: External and Internal Influences Affecting the School"

Introduction	Elizabeth Greenfield	i
Theme Paper and Supplementary Comments	John C. Flanagan	1 - 18 d
Discussion	Herman H. Long	19 - 22
Discussion	Clarence Senior	23 - 29
Response	John C. Flanagan	30 - 31
Additional Queries and Responses		32 - 54

Session Five

"The Content and Processes of Education"

Introduction	James J. Gallagher	i - v
Theme Paper and Supplementary Comments	Edgar Z. Friedenberg	1 - 28 c
Discussion	Miriam L. Goldberg	29 - 35
Discussion	Samuel Shepard, Jr.	36 - 41
Response	Edgar Z. Friedenberg	42 - 44
Additional Queries and Responses		45 - 55

Session Six

"The Recruitment and Training of Schoolmen"

Introduction	David G. Salten	i
Theme Paper and Supplementary Comments	Robert J. Schaefer	1 - 17 a
Discussion	Judson T. Shaplin	18 - 24
Discussion	Theodore R. Sizer	25 - 32
Response	Robert J. Schaefer	33 - 34
Additional Queries and Responses		35 - 54

Session Seven

"Beyond the Twelfth Year: The Problem of Continuing Education"

Introduction	John F. White	i
Theme Paper and Supplementary Comments	John W. Powell	1 - 27 c
Discussion	Louis M. Hacker	28 - 34
Discussion	Ernest van den Haag	35 - 40
Response	John W. Powell	41 - 43
Additional Queries and Responses		44 - 48

Part II THE COSTS OF QUALITY AND EQUALITY IN EDUCATION

"The Economic Costs of Quality and Equality in Education"
Seymour E. Harris 1 - 12

"The Social Costs of Quality and Equality in Education"
Robin M. Williams, Jr. 1 - 25

"The Psychological Costs of Quality and Equality in Education"
Urie Bronfenbrenner 1 - 15

Part III "Quality and Equality in American Education: A Partisan Essay"
Melvin M. Tumin and Marvin Bressler 1 - 49

Part IV SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 1 - 30

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

James E. Allen, Jr.
Commissioner of Education
State of New York

Norton L. Beach
Professor of Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

Arthur Bestor
Professor of History
University of Washington

Marvin Bressler
Professor of Sociology
Chairman
Roger Williams Straus
Council on Human Relations
Princeton University

Urie Bronfenbrenner
Professor of Child Development
Cornell University

R. Freeman Butts
Professor in the Foundations of Education
Associate Dean for International Studies
Teachers College
Columbia University

Oscar Cohen
Director, Program Division
Anti-Defamation League
New York

Martin Deutsch
Director
Institute for Developmental Studies
New York Medical College
New York

Henry S. Dyer
Vice President
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey

John C. Flanagan
President
American Institute for Research
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Boris Ford
Dean
School of Education and Social Work
University of Sussex
Sussex, England

Edgar Z. Friedenberg
Professor of Sociology
University of California at Davis

James J. Gallagher
Associate Director
Institute for Research on Exceptional Children
University of Illinois

Miriam L. Goldberg
Associate Professor of Psychology and Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

Elizabeth Greenfield
Chairman
Committee on Quality Education
Member
Board of Education
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

Louis M. Hacker
Professor of Economics
Columbia University

Seymour E. Harris
Professor of Economics
University of California
at San Diego

Sidney Hook
Head
Department of Philosophy
New York University

Francis A. J. Ianni
Director
Division of Educational Institutions and Programs
Teachers College
Columbia University

Samuel A. Kirk
Director
Institute for Research on
Exceptional Children
University of Illinois

Herman H. Long
President
Talladega College
Talladega, Alabama

John Henry Martin
Superintendent
Mt. Vernon Public Schools
Mt. Vernon, New York

Martin Mayer
Author
New York

John J. McKenna
Superintendent
Township Board of Education
Princeton, New Jersey

Barbara McNeill
Program Analyst
Bureau of Research
U.S. Office of Education
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
Washington, D.C.

Joseph Monserrat
Director
Migration Division
Department of Labor
Commonwealth of Puerto Rico
New York

John Walker Powell
Director of Curriculum
University of Miami

Fritz Redl
Professor of Social Work
School of Social Work
Wayne State University

Peter H. Rossi
Professor of Sociology
University of Chicago
Director
National Opinion Research Center
Chicago

David G. Salten
Former Superintendent of Schools
New Rochelle, New York
Director
Federation of Jewish Philanthropies
New York

Robert J. Schaefer
Dean
Teachers College
Columbia University

Milton Schwebel
Associate Dean
School of Education
New York University

Clarence Senior
Professor of Sociology
Brooklyn College
Member
Board of Education
New York City

Judson T. Shaplin
Director
Graduate Institute of Education
Washington University

Samuel Shepard, Jr.
Assistant Superintendent
Board of Education
St. Louis

Theodore R. Sizer
Dean
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University

Sydney S. Spivack
Research Associate
Roger Williams Straus
Council on Human Relations
Princeton University

Chester R. Stroup
Superintendent
Borough Board of Education
Princeton, New Jersey

Harold Taylor
Author and Educator
New York

Martin Trow
Professor of Sociology
University of California
at Berkeley

Melvin M. Tumin
Professor of Sociology and
Anthropology
Princeton University

Ernest van den Haag
Professor of Social Thought
New School for Social Research
New York

Sloan R. Wayland
Professor of Sociology and
Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

John F. White
President
National Educational Television
Association
New York

Robin M. Williams, Jr.
Professor of Sociology
Cornell University

Norman D. Kurland
Center for Innovation in Education
State Education Department
State of New York

INTRODUCTION

A fund-raising pamphlet, first issued in 1752, by the College of New Jersey, later Princeton University, begins with an affirmation that was even then common lore: "Nothing has a more direct Tendency to advance the Happiness and Glory of a Community, than the founding of public Schools and Seminaries of Learning, for the Education of Youth, and adorning their minds with useful Knowledge and Virtue." The evidence for this assertion presumably rested on "Daily Observation" that "evinces, that in Proportion as Learning makes its Progress in a Country, it softens the natural Roughness, eradicates the Prejudices, and transforms the Genius and Disposition of its Inhabitants. New Jersey, and the adjacent Provinces, already feel the happy Effects of this useful Institution."*

It is peculiarly appropriate that two centuries later Princeton should be the site of a conference whose theme "Quality and Equality in Education" implies that these "happy Effects" will not be diffused throughout the land until high quality schooling is equally accessible to all Americans regardless of creed, color, national origin, social class, or differences in talent. The achievement of this end is both a social necessity and a moral obligation that is not fully discharged by the national commitment to tax-supported, universal, compulsory education. The equal right to attend some school is merely a necessary but not sufficient condition for "equal educational opportunity." A more adequate definition of this concept would be attentive to the full range of variables in school and society that enhance or impede learning. There is no real parity when some children are systematically handicapped by environmentally induced social and psychological deficits or when the schools dispense high quality education exclusively to the academically gifted.

Recent research on the problems of the poor, Negroes, and Puerto Ricans leaves no doubt that the school system magnifies the inequities of a stratified society by offering some children superior education while denying it to others. Meanwhile, the mediocre or below average student from high income communities is victimized in a more subtle fashion. He is often publicly symbolized as a failure by a school that measures its own success by the proportions of its graduates accepted by prestige colleges. The result is in varying degrees similar in both cases: the individual child experiences a deflation of self, anxiety, and hostility. At the societal level, lack of educational opportunity severely restricts the positive functions of education as a mechanism for recruiting and discovering talent, as an agent for economic growth, as a vehicle for social mobility, and as an instrument for peacable social change.

---

* Gilbert Tennent and Samuel Davies, A General Account of the Rise and State of the College, Lately Established in the Province of New-Jersey in America, (London 1754), p. 3 quoted in Richard Hofstadter and Wilson Smith (eds.), American Higher Education (Vol. One), The University of Chicago Press, 1961. pp. 91-92.

Discussions about these matters have not always been responsible. During the "Great Debate" on education, the "critics'" overwhelming preoccupation with the problem of gifted children debased the concept of equality, while the "educationists'" seeming indifference to intellectual rigor violated the principle of quality. In view of these circumstances, it seemed urgent to convoke schoolmen and academics of diverse viewpoints, disciplinary affiliations and experiences for the purposes of identifying goals and suggesting the means of furnishing a high quality education for all. It was assumed that a rational strategy for dealing with these matters required that the work of the conference should be primarily oriented to general criteria and principles, while concrete "how to" problems should be postponed until more general issues had been satisfactorily resolved. Thus, for example, although much of the conference was devoted to the problems of "individualization of instruction," there was comparatively little discussion on the allocation of "class hours" to various disciplines, the appropriate sequence of cognitive development, and other technical questions of curriculum and instruction. Similarly, the urgency of integrating the schools was implied throughout, but there were no full-scale discussions on the pace at which it should proceed, racial ratios, the bussing controversy, and kindred matters.

The selection of specific topics within the context of the broader theme was guided by the conviction that, in its most fundamental form, education consists of a classroom, teachers, pupils, and a set of organized experiences that are designed to yield pre-selected outcomes. These include, at minimum, changes in knowledge, skill, values, and personality adequacy. However, the miniature social system of the classroom is connected through the school to a larger institutional complex that restricts its autonomy. In the most general sense, the classroom is influenced by the total characteristics of American society and the educational system. More specifically, activities within the school are importantly determined by the aims that society seeks to achieve through formal education, the human and natural resources it allots to these purposes and the means within the educational system that are selected to accomplish the desired ends.

These considerations suggested the adoption of the following agenda with the expectation that each topic should be considered in relationship to the main theme of "quality and equality in education."

I. "Polarities and Tensions in the Educational System"
Chairman: James E. Allen, Jr.
Paper: Harold Taylor
Discussants: Sidney Hook and Martin Mayer

The intent of this session was to explore such traditional yet living controversies as the excellence of the elite vs. the excellence of all; the conservation of values vs. the introduction of change; education for the "mind" vs. education for the "whole person."

II. "The Challenge of Group Differences
Chairman: John Henry Martin
Paper: Peter H. Rossi
Discussants: Martin Deutsch and Martin Trow

The emphasis in this session was on the anticipated, unavoidable, and permanent fact of diversity in the American population.. Diversity arising in part from racial distinctions and differences arising in part from class differences are at present of greatest significance.

III."The Challenge of Individual Differences"
Chairman: Henry S. Dyer
Paper: Samuel A. Kirk
Discussants: Fritz Redl and Milton Schwebel

This session was devoted to inter- and intra-individual variation and to those forms of diversity that are presumably "pathological" and susceptible to remedial action.

IV. "Education in the Social System: External and Internal Influences Affecting the School"
Chairman: Elizabeth Greenfield
Paper: John C. Flanagan
Discussants: Herman H. Long and Clarence Senior

The main concern of this session was to explore the range of influences inside and outside the classroom that affect the educational process. The emphasis was on the relationship between school and society, and on the internal structure of the educational system.

V. "The Content and Processes of Education"
Chairman: James J. Gallagher
Paper: Edgar Z. Friedenberg
Discussants: Miriam L. Goldberg and Samuel Shepard, Jr.

This session was designed to deal with the formal content of the curriculum, methods by which this content is transmitted, the role of evaluation in assessing the success or failure of these methods, and the role of research in the production of new knowledge and methods.

VI. "The Recruitment and Training of Schoolmen"
Chairman: David G. Salten
Paper: Robert J. Schaefer
Discussants: Judson T. Shaplin and Theodore R. Sizer

This session focused on the cultural values, social mechanisms, and institutional resources that affect the motivation, the training process, the development of appropriate roles and career histories of teachers and administrators.

VII. "Beyond the Twelfth Year: The Problem of Continuing Education"
Chairman: John F. White
Paper: John Walker Powell
Discussants: Louis M. Hacker and Ernest van den Haag

This session was based on the assumption that education should be a life-long process for all segments of the population. It considered the appropriate contribution of college, adult and self-education in achieving this goal.

Harold Taylor's keynote paper revealed the massive mood of discontent that was to characterize much of the conference. According to Taylor, the functions of the school should be defined by two features of contemporary American society: its "mass" character, and the requirements of democratic existence. The problem is everywhere to discover how to deal with huge numbers of people so that "each can share in responsibility for his own choices, each can be linked directly to the sources of political and social power, and each can be enhanced in the dimension of his personal growth." The Anti-Poverty Program, the civil rights movement, the Peace Corps, and the student movements are to some degree novel and welcome responses to this challenge.

However, according to Taylor, educational policy and practice has not been similarly responsive to the perplexities of contemporary life. One index of inadequacy is that the entire budget for education at all levels -- local, state, and federal -- is less than half of the combined expenditures for military purposes and space exploration. Such resources as do exist are not used to best effect. The schools have failed to recognize the needs of a democratic society by concentrating their efforts on limited functions and a selected segment of the population. The interpretation of education which is confined to the improvement of instruction in the cognitive sphere, while underemphasizing the psychological and social dimensions, has led to the development of a "standard curriculum adapted to a standard child who, when seen in action, turns out to be a middle-class white Protestant achiever." The schools have too often regarded themselves as manpower agencies that provide the trained cadre of "scientists, technologists, linguists, and others who can man the going organization." The high school thus becomes primarily a conveyor belt that is designed to transport young people to prestige colleges. Meanwhile, the academically average student and those victimized by low income, racial discrimination, and impoverished environments are neglected.

The result is a real danger that there may develop "two cultures with two educational systems designed to foster them, one for the masses, the other for an elite . . ." The products of both tend to be deficient in sensibility, self-knowledge, spontaneous life styles, and are content with a "television-watching, movie-going mass culture, the target of the social critics, and the delight of the advertising agencies." The solution rests in the mobilization of all the resources of the schools -- the spirit of social concern that motivated them in the thirties; the extension of such experiments as ungraded classrooms, remedial teaching, pre-school programs and the like; new teacher training programs -- to achieve genuine equality of opportunity in education. This may be defined, according to Taylor, as follows:

> Equality in its fuller sense means that at each level and within the particular situation of each child, education must be designed to deal with the child's situation, whatever it might be. Within the broader meaning of equality, quality of education is measured by how well it deals with the child's total development, how much it increases his capacity to think, to learn, to grow, to mature, to establish his own identity and his own usefulness to himself, to others, and to his society.

Sidney Hook and Martin Mayer, who discussed Taylor's paper, dissented from his analysis in numerous particulars. Both took issue with the strength of Taylor's emphasis on utilizing the school as an agency of social reform and his blanket indictment of middle class values. Each believes that the school makes its maximum contribution not by a direct onslaught on social ills but rather by indirection -- that is by developing imaginative, critical, well informed people. If the schools defined their function as the reconstruction of society, they would be undertaking tasks which they are not equipped to perform and that fall properly within the province of home, church, and state. They also agreed that it is important to distinguish between various kinds of middle class standards because some value commitments are demonstrably functional and others dysfunctional for living in a modern, complex, industrial society.

The discussants, themselves, were not in accord on at least one major point. Mayer detected a "logical antagonism" between "equality" and "diversity." Professor Hook, however, argues that this distinction confuses "equal" with "identical." Democratic theory recognizes that people differ in capacities and achievements but it insists on an equality of concern for all men. Thus, a school whose program makes due allowances for the individual differences of all of its students is at the same time demonstrating the compatibility of the concepts "equality" and "diversity."

Peter Rossi's paper deals largely with the group and categorical barriers to the achievement of quality and equality in education. Although he paid tribute to a number of the historical achievements of the American system of education including its generous political support for schools that have been remarkably effective in training talent, providing opportunities, and assimilating a heterogeneous population, Rossi was less sanguine about the capacity of education to deal with current challenges. The heart of the dilemma, as he sees it, is that it is no longer as possible to utilize persons of low educational attainment in the labor force with the result that the function of absorbing deprived groups "into the mainstream of American society has been largely allocated to education in a period in which small success will be judged as failure." These populations are characterized by "poor ability, [as measured by standard devices] scanty knowledge, and low levels of motivation, at levels of deficiency far below those 'normally' encountered in dealing with the 'standard' American school population." These differences have their origins in differential wealth and income, dysfunctional cultural patterns, and punitive psychological experiences. As Rossi points out:

> to be lower class and/or Negro in contemporary America is to know from a very early point in life that one is different from 'standard' American and different in ways which are devalued. This is the sense in which to be in such groups is to be continuously punished.

These historically conditioned disabilities result in apathy, aggression, a deviant value system, and an unstable family structure that perpetuate an unhappy legacy.

Rossi proposes two major forms of intervention. The first consists of "breaking the vicious cycle" by exposing children to supplementary experiences such as pre-school programs, "Higher Horizons" type projects, perhaps even neighborhood residential schools, and by enriching ordinary schooling by such measures as tutoring programs and imaginative use of volunteers. The second form of intervention involves introducing basic social reforms such as the establishment of a floor under income, changes in the stratification profile, and the extension of legal equality to everyone. In undertaking such action, society should be mindful of certain generally desirable characteristics that should characterize all programs of intervention, i.e. they should be 1) potentially capable of affecting large numbers of people, 2) involve manageable costs in human and natural resources, and 3) be capable of producing significant effects.

In commenting on Rossi's paper, Martin Trow indicated that the commitment to all forms of intervention was in large measure determined by an allegiance to the "strong" as opposed to the "weak" versions of equality of opportunity.

> The 'weak' concept, the traditional liberal view of equality of educational opportunity, would remove all external barriers, birth and wealth, which would handicap the transition of intelligence into academic achievement and then career achievement. In that view, intelligence is more or less fixed largely genetically, or at least treated as if it were so, and the demand is that able boys and girls of humble birth be given access to decent education . . .
>
> The 'strong' conception of equality of opportunity sees intelligence as achieved and calls for equalizing the opportunities for gaining intelligence. The demand is much more radical in its implications, since much of intelligence is acquired or aborted in the family. Thus this doctrine calls for quite active measures to help the family help its children, however much we are inclined to flee from those who

> come to help us, and further measures to supplement families' efforts through what might be called compensatory socialization. This is a commitment to help the child, despite the family's inability or indifference or, even, its active opposition. . .
>
> A basic difference between the weak conception of educational opportunity and the strong is the difference in the demands it makes on the schools for the success of the student. Under the weak conception, whatever else might have been said about it, the student's failure basically is placed on his own shoulders. Under the strong concept, the student's failure is seen as a failure of the schools or the teachers, and this is what people have been calling for from time to time, yesterday and today. This makes, of course, much severer demands on the school and teachers. I think it in part accounts for the new concerns for educational reform and for our search of ways to intervene in our search for levers.

The adoption of "strong" notions of equality would require extensive efforts to improve the quality of instruction and to alter the climate of teaching and learning. These would include differential rewards for teaching in difficult circumstances, the training of teachers in slum living, the use of some forms of programmed instruction, experimentation with different ratios of racial and class mixtures, and manipulation of the curriculum to encourage the spirit of intellectual adventure rather than boredom. We must also be prepared to examine the effectiveness of the structure of the school system itself, particularly the decision-making process. And like Rossi, Trow speaks of the possibility of basic social changes including the establishment of minimum income provisions, full civil and legal rights for all, compensatory socialization in family situations, and perhaps even a negative income tax.

From the vantage point of his immense authority as a pioneer in pre-school programs, Martin Deutsch cautioned that we may be expecting too much from this form of intervention. It is unlikely that such experiences will substantially reduce cumulative social and psychological deficits unless they are 1) articulated with subsequent school programs, 2) effectively interpreted to parents and the school system, and 3) taught by instructors who find gratification in teaching "slow" children. It is evident that Deutsch feels that, in the haste to introduce pre-school programs, some of these conditions have been neglected. It is essential at the very least to introduce into all such efforts systematic provisions for effective evaluation. Such evaluation as now exists tends to be inadequate. According to Deutsch: "It has been evaluation of output variables; an evaluation of performance, not evaluation of process; not evaluation of where learning takes place or how it takes place."

The entire problem of introducing a greater measure of equality and quality in the education of the disadvantaged is, of course, only one aspect of the broader question of how to provide individualized instruction for all children, no matter what their social origin. Papers by Samuel Kirk, John Flanagan, and Edgar Friedenberg dealing with various facets of "individual diversity" provoked the spirited discussion on the merits of ability grouping and the use of tests that was to occupy much of the subsequent attention of the conference.

Kirk's admirable treatment of inter-individual differences (variability among members of a group) and intra-individual differences (variability within the same person at different points of time) clearly indicates how moot are the assumptions underlying homogeneous grouping. The author cited the evidence compiled by H. G. Shane showing that there are no fewer than thirty-five plans that have been adopted by schools to group children according to one or more differentiae. Thus, for example, it is common to classify by such broad categories as "gifted" and "retarded" but there is no clearcut evidence that these practices have been beneficial. As Kirk points out, "one of the reasons why a simple administrative organization has not solved all of the problems encountered by variability in children is that gifted children or mentally retarded children do not themselves form a homogeneous group." Considerable data substantiate that retarded children exceed the average in weight, height, and motor coordination. There is considerable overlap in sensory and motor areas and even in interpersonal relations.

The rationale for ordinary "tracking" procedures within normal populations, that are based on the assumption that intelligence is a fixed quantity, are equally questionable. Kirk's summary is instructive:

> The extensive literature available today indicates, a) that the I.Q.'s of young children are not constant when we exclude the clinical and pathological cases such as mongoloids; b) that the greatest increases and decreases occur mostly between birth and three years of age; c) that increases and decreases in tested intelligence can occur between ages four and seven but in diminishing extent; and d) that enriched or

> stimulating environments can increase the rate of development of children from disadvantaged homes even at a later age, and e) that the increases are in inverse relationship to the age of the child.

These findings suggest that any grouping of children based on the assumption that intelligence is an immutable entity is not consistent with the evidence. They also lead Kirk to conclude with others that, since most of the growth or decline in tested intelligence occurs before the age of three, pre-nursery schools should be established for those children whose environments are unfavorable to learning.

In his discussion of children with special disabilities or behavior disorders, Kirk emphasizes that the school need not always, a la psychiatrists and caseworkers, treat "underlying causes." Frequently disabilities may be dealt with at the symptomatic level and in individual tutorial situations. He cites as illustrations the instance of a boy whose emotional disturbances were alleviated by the removal of a reading deficiency and an account of twenty-five boys, most of whom were cured of biting their nails by the simple expedient of having a manicurist file them shorter.

The discussants of the paper, Fritz Redl and Milton Schwebel, concurred in Kirk's views that some problems are adequately disposed of by treating them purely as learning difficulties. Schwebel suggested that attention to such simple matters as teaching children how to study might alleviate many of their tensions and anxieties and that requisite individual tutoring might well be undertaken by the unorthodox method of recruiting able students to teach others.

At the same time, Redl emphasized that Kirk had perhaps unwittingly shown disrespect for clinical complexity. "Symptoms" differ in their significance. Some are of no interest to the clinician, but others are indicative of subsurface problems that must be treated with available modes of psychotherapy. In any case, it is important to recognize that children are much more varied and puzzling than clinical classifications would indicate and that they do not conveniently classify themselves in accord with textbook categories.

John Flanagan found himself discussing many of these same issues in his paper on the "external" and "internal" influences affecting the school, some of which Clarence Senior made more vivid by specific references to New York. Some of the external factors cited include the rise of science and technology, the changing character of urban communities, conflicts between various political subdivisions, the increasing salience of international relations, and a growing emphasis on quality education for the gifted. Internal problems include tradition and inertia within the educational system, poor quality of textbooks, the distribution of talent within the education professions, and the changing characteristics of the school population. The complexity that arises from the convergence of these "external" and "internal" forces lead Flanagan to conclude that schools must constantly evaluate their programs in the manner of the management procedures and technologies used by modern business organizations.

His main focus was the desirability of developing a procedure that would 1) define the school's goals in behavioral terms; 2) devise means for measuring the child's potential for achieving these goals, the amount he has already learned and the rates at which he has learned; 3) introduce methods of evaluating instructional material and practices; and 4) collect data on the subsequent experiences of students with selected characteristics who have been exposed to various curricula and teaching strategies. Since it is difficult to store so much information in the head of any one individual, these data would be committed to the memory of a computer which would feed them to school personnel as quickly as they were needed. Although these proposals offended some members of the conference as excessively mechanistic, Flanagan intended them to assist individual students to achieve their own personal goals. According to him:

> To assist the student in planning long-range educational and occupational goals, the counselor would compare the same comprehensive student data in the computer memory with norms based on studies of the experience of students with similar characteristics. For example, if the student indicated he is seriously considering engineering, the counselor can inform him that 80 per cent of the boys with this pattern of aptitudes, interests, achievement, and activities who enter college engineering courses graduate.

Herman Long, one discussant of Flanagan's paper, objected to the fact that the evaluation procedures cited were not germane to the problems of equality of educational opportunity because they failed to take into account that Negroes, low income groups, and others were afflicted by varying degrees of chronic disability. An approach that appeared to assume that the observed characteristics of children adequately represent their "true" capacities in effect countenanced the continued existence of current inequities. During the same session, Clarence Senior noted with some satisfaction that in his home city, New York, achievement tests have been substituted for I.Q. tests which assume that "measured intelligence" is free from the contamination of environmental influences.

Many conferees apparently shared the skepticism about the value of group testing. Their chief objections seemed to be that prior knowledge about students in the form of group norms might lead to undesirable instructional practices which would hinder the discovery of the child's capabilities. Samuel Shepard describes what may occur in many classrooms when teachers pattern their instruction to the I.Q. of their students:

> Mary has an I.Q. of 119. Mary doesn't respond very quickly, so what does the teacher do? Now, come on, Mary, you can do this. You know how we did it last week. Well, she starts pushing, she starts motivating, stimulating, encouraging, and she doesn't give up until she is satisfied with Mary's performance.
>
> What happens typically when she calls on old Charles over here with 71? Well, if he grunts clearly, she pats him on the shoulder: that's fine. Now, you be here tomorrow and we will move the pianos and water the flowers and you can dust the erasers and you can do all of these things. This is differentiating the instruction according to the ability of the kid. This is the kind of chance that old Charles gets. He doesn't have a sucker's chance. He has no such thing as an equal educational opportunity. What stimulation and motivation does he have? None.

The expression of strong misgivings about testing was by no means unanimous. While all agreed that standard measuring devices were subject to abuse, several conferees believed that their use was inevitable in a mass society. The remedy consists in alerting all who use tests of their danger and in converting them from instruments of invidious comparison to diagnostic devices. Mildred Goldberg added the caution that the current antipathy to the use of group I.Q. tests might be still another expression of the faddism that periodically appears in the field of education. These instruments, she thought, should not be abandoned without further study and in the absence of alternative evaluation procedures.

Edgar Friedenberg's discussion of individual differences implied that, although the conferees seemed united in their willingness to respect individual diversity in the cognitive realm, they were not similarly zealous about the right of children to reject the middle class, bureaucratic "wheeling and dealing" ethos. Thus, Friedenberg argued, while it is true that children must be taught to survive in a corrupt and conformist society, they should not be persuaded of its moral superiority. Genuine quality education would not encourage them to develop the "marketing" orientation that is so characteristic of success in school and society. The school is especially culpable when it confuses spontaneous and open life styles that in their totality represent "fidelity to self" with pathology and in the name of treatment and helping seeks to reclaim the student for the sterile world of their "better adjusted" peers and elders. This, Friedenberg holds, is simply an unwarranted intrusion on the privacy and integrity of the individual personality. In general, the author was skeptical as to whether those persons who proposed to intervene in behalf of the underprivileged would be willingly retained by those whom they would help.

Both Miriam Goldberg and Samuel Shepard who discussed Friedenberg's paper were sympathetic to his concern for the individuality of students. However, Shepard, whose Bannecker Program in St. Louis is one of the few demonstrably successful efforts to introduce greater quality and equality in education, contended that:

> Middle class values and behavior patterns characterize the mainstream of American life. The culturally-disadvantaged Negro is largely outside of that stream and, indeed, often incompatible with it, certainly in the urban centers of the nation. The very survival of the Negro and of the democratic way of life itself demands that no large segment of our population be allowed to be apart from this stream.

Professor Goldberg was not altogether persuaded by the privacy arguments advanced by Dr. Friedenberg.

> We have only a bare beginning and there is a great deal that needs to be learned about how to compensate for every deficiency; how to present learning tasks to children and, yes, how to help them want to learn. If this is an intrusion of their privacy, so be it. But without this intrusion they will not learn to read and write, to deal with ideas or develop their talents. If we guard their privacy from intrusion by the school, it will remain a privacy of discouragement and defeat, of distorted self-image and self-rejection and be left wide open to the intrusion of destructive forces which prey upon the marginal individual.

It is evident that both Goldberg and Shepard do not believe that the failure to intervene liberates the individual. We are obliged to try to change the lives of our students, but we should do so, as Dr. Goldberg puts it, by creating "learning situations in which children with great ranges of ability, children with diverse interests and bents and talents can proceed with their education."

Every such aspiration for the improvement in the quality of instruction directs our attention to the recruitment and training of schoolmen. Robert Schaefer's paper emphasizes that although extrinsic motivations such as salary, fringe benefits, and social status are important elements in attracting and retaining teachers it is probable that "the kinds of psychic rewards available in the instructional situation itself are of more fundamental importance to the teacher than the tangible apples society may choose to place on his desk." The availability of such rewards are, however, sharply restricted in "slum schools" by the inadequacy of the teacher's collegiate preparation and the frustrations of his actual teaching situation. His professional training does not equip him to develop a logic of pedagogical presentation that parallels the underlying structure of the discipline. He is thus not prepared to translate the abstractions of the conventional university course in history, mathematics, literature, or science into experiences that are meaningful to students with low academic motivations in schools located in "disadvantaged" urban neighborhoods. He may know even less about "how to deal with youngsters who have not already been convinced by their social backgrounds that the school is a necessary and reasonable institution." Moreover, the neophyte teacher seldom receives substantial help from older colleagues since they, themselves, have often grown cynical and weary from a similar inability to cope with the mysteries of children and curriculum. The net result is that the teacher in "deprived" areas derives little intellectual satisfaction from his daily burdens.

Schaefer suggests that both teachers' colleges and the schools are culpable in this situation, but that "the basic fact is our ignorance; we simply don't know how to entice the elusive intellects of lower class children let alone how to achieve the mastery of abstract knowledge and analytical skills modern society demands." What is required are school boards and superintendents who are prepared to acknowledge the inadequacy of the existing state of knowledge and who are prepared to convert slum schools into centers of inquiry which would be concerned with the production as well as the transmission of knowledge. Since, according to Schaefer, "the problems of urban education are inherently fascinating," a new breed of teacher-scholar could be attracted to low income schools because they could be offered psychic rewards in the form of intellectual satisfactions that are now denied them.

If Schaefer seeks inventive, even radical solutions, he does so with the expectation that these may be introduced under the auspices of the present educational system. Judson Shaplin believes, by contrast, that given the magnitude and complexity of the dilemmas that now beset us it is necessary to seek assistance from "outside the profession." He identifies a number of constraints that limit mass recruitment of able teachers for low income schools: a limited pool of talent, the low prestige of teacher training, the tendency of graduates of elite colleges to teach in elite schools, and the preference of teachers to remain in their own neighborhood. Under these circumstances, Shaplin argues, it is imperative to discover new institutional channels through which talented persons can enter teaching. These might include, among others, people now engaged in other professions and those who, despite a natural gift for teaching, are now deterred from entering the profession by the excessively long period of apprenticeship. It is, moreover, essential to establish links between the educational system and a para-professional structure consisting of social agencies and volunteer groups who could provide the necessary skilled manpower that will not be available if business is conducted as usual.

Theodore Sizer disagreed with the major theses of both panelists. Unlike Schaefer, he does not believe that our chief malady is ignorance but rather the failure to make effective use of existing knowledge; unlike Shaplin, he holds that the impetus for reform must necessarily come from within the educational establishment. The guardians of the gates are professors in teacher training institutions and the relatively small proportion of people who make critical decisions in the school system. If persons who occupy these strategic positions are not competent, prospective teachers will be poorly trained, good talent will be squandered, and the schools will be stagnant. The challenge is how to reconcile two seemingly antithetical concepts, "establishment" and "revolutionary"; for what is urgently required are men in power who are nevertheless eager to serve as agents of radical change.

The final session of the conference, on continuing education, was organized on the assumption that education should not be the special privilege of youth. John Powell, like Harold

Taylor, perceived a threat to democratic institutions in the presumed widening of the gap between an educated elite and an ignorant mass. He deduces, therefore, that:

> What we are faced with is a new kind of imperative: a perception of life-long education as a patriot's duty, which may reach the force of a popular will that men and women should continue to advance their education, by whatever means, or be looked upon as slackers.

Continuing education should embrace three levels of learning: skills, knowledge, and pursuit of understanding. Some of these, such as the acquisition of skills involved in manpower training appeal to economic incentives while others enrich the spirit. But the people who seek education for any of these reasons are deplorably few. The "'motivational deficit' between what is available and what is utilized" has its source in unhappy early school experiences, ethnic despair, the lower class ethos, undue contentment with one's lot, personality disorders, and rejection of American values. The means of overcoming these barriers to learning exist in the form of motivational devices including those refined by the mass media. These should be imaginatively utilized to persuade the apathetic to enrich their lives. It is also critical to define educational objectives so that they will be consistent with clearcut national purposes, including the development of a "mature" citizenry. At present, adult education suffers from an embarrassment of riches. Its offerings represent a gigantic smorgasbord which permits "an almost total freedom of often meaningless choice."

Lewis Hacker and Ernest van den Haag who discussed Powell's paper shared a number of discontents in common. Both dissent from the view that adult education should be pursued in obedience to a sort of "general will" that is primarily responsive to over-riding national purpose. Schooling beyond the twelfth year should, according to both critics, be governed by a pluralism dictated by consumer sovereignty that might quite conceivably find expression in a great range of lofty and frivolous pursuits. Moreover, Hacker and van den Haag both assert that the decision not to seek further education might represent a rational choice as balanced against other uses of time and energy. In general, each doubted that American society was in as dire need of salvation as Powell had indicated, or that adult education should serve as an instrument for its redemption.

It should be clear from the preceding sketchy synopses that during a crowded three days the conferees confronted a formidable number of important issues bearing on quality and equality in education. However, as in every such collective enterprise, there were inevitable lacunae. Since the participants in any conference approach its major theme from the perspective of their own specialized interests, it is not reasonable to expect them to consider either the generic meaning of crucial terms or the full range of the conditions that must be satisfied if aspirations are to become tangible accomplishments.

Accordingly, four additional essays were written at the end of the conference. Three of these by Urie Bronfenbrenner, Seymour Harris, and Robin Williams deal with the psychological, economic, and social costs of achieving quality education for all. Each in its own fashion delineates the price that must be paid in increased allocation of resources, altered institutional arrangements, and revised standards of welfare if we are really serious about our goals. In the concluding piece we shall exercise the editors' prerogative of speaking the final words on many of the problems that occupied the conferees and some that did not. This integrative essay consists of an educational credo that affirms our own partisan convictions about quality and equality in education.

This volume, then, includes four parts:

Part I consists of seven papers that were circulated in advance of the conference; a summary and supplementary statement by the writer of the paper; two critical evaluations; a summary statement by the chairman of the session; and an edited record of remarks by other participants.

Part II includes the three papers on the psychological, economic, and social costs of achieving quality and equality in education.

Part III contains the final essay by the editors.

Part IV is an annotated bibliography devoted to the seven major topics of the conference for the benefit of those who wish to explore these issues further.

The discussions in each of these sections raise more questions than they answer. Nevertheless, the shared sense of moral urgency that prevailed at the Princeton conference on quality and equality in education augers well for the future. Indeed, passions sometimes triumphed over the bland etiquette of conference protocol. At one point, one writer of a major paper remarked that "those of us who have sat in this particular seat have found ourselves unconsciously developing a way of glancing down to see whether wires run into the wall and where the switch is." As the reader explores the papers in this volume and eavesdrops on the discussions, we trust that he will share some of the sense of intellectual excitement that arises when good minds clash over issues which truly engage them.

SESSION ONE

Theme: POLARITIES AND TENSIONS IN THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

Introduction	JAMES E. ALLEN	i - ii
Theme Paper and Supplementary Comments	HAROLD TAYLOR	1 - 13 c
Discussion	SIDNEY HOOK	14 - 20
Discussion	MARTIN MAYER	21 - 30
Response	HAROLD TAYLOR	31 - 38
Additional Queries and Responses		39 - 53

INTRODUCTION
by
James E. Allen

Our subject tonight is "Polarities and Tensions in the Educational System." One of the tensions in my quest for quality and equality in education, and I expect this is true of most of you, is reflected in my being here. When I think of the work that is piling up on my desk during these two days, my tensions rise. I feel a polarity between my desire to be here to take time to think through with you the way to meet our current problems and my desire to get on with the job of trying to get a budget passed in the New York State Legislature, the job of initiating and supporting new projects so that next year we will be able to do better than we did this year, the job of meeting the press and the public and trying to develop a climate for better support of education, and the new job of working with dozens of Federal, State, and local agencies to make the Anti-Poverty Act a reality.

My tension is symbolic of that in education today between the desire to build a new intellectual foundation for education in a free society and the need to act now. I hope that this very distinguished company can help ease this tension. We need to know what kind of education we should be offering to meet varied individual needs, how to get individuals to accept the education that is best for them, and how to get society to provide the resources to give to each the quality of education that will help him realize all that he is capable of becoming. And certainly this is a tall order.

It is made even more difficult by the scale of the problem. To be realistic, solutions must take into account the numbers who must be educated, the shortness of time we have to educate them, and the limited number of people available to do the job. Too many programs deal with hundreds when the need is in the thousands, or would do in 50 years what must be done in five.

There is another polarity that is very much on our minds these days, between our desire to help directly those who seem most in need of help, namely, what are called today the disadvantaged, and our recognition that at least half of the problem is the attitude of those who are supposedly advantaged. Until those attitudes are changed, our efforts will generate more tensions than they resolve.

And finally, there is the tension between our notion that the way to solution lies in better education for a world of work and our recognition that the world may have little work for most people to do. Of course, I guess if most of us could share our own labors, we would solve the problem of unemployment. Do we educate for employment and hope that the jobs will be there? Or educate for leisure and hope that society will change to make a dignified life of leisure possible for all who wish it? Wherever the there of tomorrow is, how do we get from here to there?

SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS
by
Harold Taylor

What apparently bothers me is that in a big society where we are trying to develop new cultural forms and new social institutions adequate to keep up to the changes that are occurring within the society, the educators themselves are making some assumptions and are concerning themselves with the implications of those assumptions in a way which I don't think is meeting the essential issue.

The essential need in a mass culture is to find new ways of dealing with a set of new problems with which the present institutions of the society are inadequte to deal. I have been bothered by the inadequacy of the curricular reforms which have not kept up with the changes in the society and the dislocation between curricular reforms and the actual conditions of the society itself.

The problem is: How do you develop qualities within the educational institutions which can, without diluting the effort of individuals in the teaching faculty, educate each person in his own terms? I find that the frame of reference in which educational thinking is going on in contemporary America is one which shows the problem of this dislocation.

When we think of the way in which the poverty program was developed, and the kind of implications that this has for New York State, we find very good people like Pat Moynahan and Adam Yarmolinsky working very fast to write legislation to get a poverty program going. And while these are inventive people who know what are the social issues in America, and what needs to be done, we are hurrying to get legislation which can put into effect the economic and social consequences of modified programs of government aid, without a continuing body of thought and research going into what are the problems in the society which education can solve, if we would move ahead of the situations which emerge as society changes.

While the poverty program will have and must have a profound effect on the educational situation in the United States, it is essentially an improvised program, producing a new set of problems about which nobody has done a study.

I use this simply as an example of what I've pointed out in the paper as a split in the culture between the organization of a mass society and the organization of a meritocracy or an elite. The present tendency among educators is to think of the educational questions in academic terms, so that you have, on the one hand, a group of people who are very much concerned to solve the social questions in the country and, on the other hand, a group of people who are concerned to solve the educational questions, as if the two weren't so completely combined that it's impossible to talk about the one without the other.

I tried to say this bluntly in these words: "The paradox of the present situation is that while educational leadership remains tied to conventional academic concepts of content and structure, political leadership within the executive branch of government has broken new ground in education by concerning itself with the improvement of social and economic conditions. Or, to put it another way, while Mr. Conant is advocating reforms within the educational structure and the coordination of existing bureaucracies, Mr. Shriver, Mr. Wirtz, and their colleagues are inventing new programs of education designed to remedy defects produced by the present structure and its bureaucracies. In doing so, they are creating a demand for reforms in all aspects of the educational system, particularly in the field of teacher preparation, where the present emphasis on increasing academic content and professional skill has distracted attention from the need for teachers with direct experience of the society in which the child and young adult are situated."

I would add that if we are to get at the key question of quality of education in a mass culture, we have to relate what we are doing in the schools to the issues in the society. I would number among the advantages which we now have such forces as a new student movement which takes students into the slums and into the South to develop new educational programs of the students' own devising, the renewed interest on the part of the government, through the Office of Education, in serious research on those questions having to do with social, economic and educational change, increased interest on the part of the academic community at large in the problems of curriculum in the sciences, the social studies and in literature.

I would identify as another resource those who speak critically of American education, from whatever point of view, insofar as they raise issues which previously had no visibility at all. These issues have recently become more visible partly through the Negro protest movement, partly through the renewed interest on the part of the academic faculties in serious educational questions, partly through the public interest in education as evidenced by public discussions which previously did not take place.

There are all forces working toward the identification of the crucial issues that jointly face the educators and the critics of society.

DISCUSSION

by

Sidney Hook

I want to make it clear that my critical comments are in the nature of questions to Mr. Taylor, which I am sure, in the light of his vast educational experience, he will be able to answer, but which I didn't find answered in his paper. Mr. Taylor makes a number of statements -- some true, some not quite true, some extremely dubious -- about the American power structure, and the alleged military-industrial-governmental bureaucratic complex which has sacrificed the educational needs of the country to defense, the cold war, or whatnot.

Now, I can match almost every one of Mr. Taylor's statemtns with some other statemtns from the writings of Mr. Robert Hutchins, and from the writing of a few liberal supporters of the Council for Basic Education. I think Arthur Bestor would agree with some of these statements. And yet, Mr. Taylor's educational philosophy and program is almost completely different from that of Mr. Hutchins.

Mr. Hutchins, who agrees with Mr. Taylor's indictment of American culture, offers an educational program which I believe Mr. Taylor finds totally unacceptable. This makes me wonder about the relevance of Mr. Taylor's social propadeutic to a possible and desirable reconstruction of the American educational system. I am not denying that there may be a connection. But it has not been spelled out.

Assume that we have all the money in the world (or enough) to reconstruct our school system; that it is properly integrated racially and religiously; that it is free in the very sense that Mr. Taylor describes, "to create and support a full-bodied system of public education throughout the entire country." The questions which concern us most as educators are: What should the curriculum be? How should it be taught? How should it be organized? What would an education of quality be? Would it be the same for all on every level? What reply can be made to the widespread feeling that with mass education we are drowning in a sea of mediocrity.

Mr. Taylor does not distinguish carefully enough between two things: (1) the absence of the opportunity for all American children to make good educationally, and (2) the conception of what it means to have a good education.

Mr. Taylor does make it unmistakeably clear that whatever a good education is, American children in the main do not now have it. But I am sorely puzzled to discover what specific things he would like to substitute for the diverse curriculums of study we now have, the ways of studying them, and the organization of the schools.

He says that the new democratic conception of education "must accommodate all the people and all their children" in the public schools, although I am not sure whether, in addition to elementary school and high school, this means some kind of college as well. But at the same time he criticizes the public schools because they consider themselves primarily as institutions of academic preparation. Indeed, the public schools are taken to task for assuming that their students "will eventually take their place in the production, distribution and use of organized knowledge" -- which pretty much covers most things a person can do. There is hardly any activity which a person can engage in which does not entail "the use of organized knowledge."

Mr. Taylor carries his criticisms of the public schools to a point which queries the wisdom of what some regard as the most promising aspect of the current American school system, namely, the new programs in mathematics and physics and social studies with which many schools are experimenting. Now, this concern with knowledge is responsible, according to Mr. Taylor, for "shifting the attention of the schools to reform of the academic curriculum and away from the consideration of the entire cultural context in which educational reforms are necessary."

This quotation is important because it gives us a clue to what Mr. Taylor would like the school curriculum to stress. Instead, or perhaps in addition to, the reform of the academic curriculum, he urges "consideration of the entire cultural context in which educational reforms are necessary." This may mean any one of a number of things. It may mean that schools should study as part of their curriculum the nature of current society, its problems and its tensions. And if this is what it means, I believe that it is already part of the curriculum of studies and that where it is not, it can become part of the curriculum if educators show sufficient vigor. In any event, the study of the "entire cultural context", or even part of it, must be controlled by "organized knowledge", which Mr. Taylor thinks we stress too much.

But the quotation may mean more than this. It may mean -- and there is some evidence that this is really his meaning -- that not only should the schools consider or study the moral and social issues of the time on the appropriate curricular levels, but that the schools must in some way contribute to their solution, by taking sides, so to speak, and in this way help transform society.

And he refers nostalgically to the 1930's when, he says, the country turned to its educators and to education for some solution to the crucial issues of social and economic reorganization. Of course, the country did no such thing in the 1930's. Institutionally, the trade unions and the government played a much greater role than the schools did in the New Deal. The whole problem of the relation between school and society in a democracy is very complex, but I think that two easy positions are demonstrably false. The first is Utopianism, which believes that the schools can, by their own efforts, rebuild or reconstruct a society; and the converse is defeatism, which denies that the schools can have any, even an indirect effect, on social changes.

Actually, where the school declares itself to be an agency of social changes it is more likely to throw its support to the status quo than to revolutionize it, for obvious reasons -- the power structure is one of them.

The most desirable effects of the school in the way of social change are produced, it seems to me, by indirection through the development of imaginative, critical, well-informed young men and women.

I hope I have not done Mr. Taylor an injustice, but when in lieu of "the improvement of the content and method of academic instruction," he urges "the improvement of the total environment of values and ideas in which the young are growing up," he seems to me to be Utopian in the bad sense; that is, to be burdening the school with a task which is not its specific function to achieve. It is to expect the school to do the work of the home, the church, the state, and industry.

In another connection, Mr. Taylor deplores the fact that "educators have allowed themselves to be swept along in the flood of demands created by the growth of society." Well, I think that's true, but good causes, too, can make illegitimate demands on the school. We must distinguish between demands and demands, with the educational growth of the child as the primary criterion of selection.

There is a kind of crisis psychology which has been developing with reference to the school in this country. It has been growing in strength since the Second World War, and especially since Sputnik. It assumes that the curriculum of our colleges can and should be oriented towards meeting the specific crises which periodically threaten to set the world aflame or undermine our national survival. And it reflects itself in proposed changes in the curriculum of the high schools and elementary schools, too. It assumes that the course of study can be periodically redrawn to enable us to win a war or preserve the peace or save some threatened civil rights, prevent over-population or accumulation of wheat, or whatever good cause we deem as citizens -- and rightfully deem -- to have overwhelming priority at the moment.

Now it's one thing to aim to develop through curricular means the attitudes and capacities necessary to think through and to act in periods of crisis; it's quite another thing to believe that the special knowledge and skills required for the mastery of the specific crises can be acquired in advance of its appearance. It is one thing to develop readiness of response, a capacity to find and utilize resources in an emergency; it's quite another to train for the achievement of a specific posture, however excellent, in relation to a specific issue.

With respect to promoting generous social and political attitudes, the school may achieve more in the long run by developing the students' personalities to think, to imagine, to dream, to respond sensitively to other human beings than by explicit indoctrination in behalf of good causes.

One of the ends of formal education is the development within the student of the powers of self-education when his formal schooling ceases and in full consciousness of his personal identity, he exercises his functions as a free citizen, and gratifies whatever love of learning he has acquired in consequence of his educational experience.

What I sense in Mr. Taylor's position is a wish to dissolve the walls between school and society too soon, and to give educational weight of a disproportionate kind to the experience of the child outside the school rather than inside, and this seems to me to be premature at the stage when formal schooling is still in order.

I am all for enriching the educational experience of the child by relating what he does inside the school to what he does outside, but there must be educational guidance -- it must be structured -- and there must be controls in this process and a special role for the teacher. Society becomes a school for the individual only when he is mature, only when he is embarked upon the unending course of self-education.

In this connection two things strike me as peculiar in Mr. Taylor's account of the school. The first is his praise of the American public school of the past and its liveliness when it served "as the great leveler and the great uplifter, the place where the variety of foreign cultures met, and where children were taught to be citizens."

Well now, I attended such a school in a Williamsburg Brooklyn slum fifty years ago, and perhaps the most universal wish among the students, bright and dull, was expressed in a daily prayer that it burn down.

These were schools of conformity and boredom and cruelty on the part of the teachers to students and of students to each other. And those who continued their education, a small minority, did so despite the schooling of the melting pot, impelled by their own intellectual drives. That Mr. Taylor should make invidious comparisons between these schools of the past, in reaction to which the progressive education movement really developed, and the modern school, which is vastly more aware of the student's needs and much better equipped to cope with a diversity that in the old schools was regarded just as a short step from delinquency, is a mystery to me.

Nor can I understand why he keeps on referring to the curriculums of the modern schools as "middle-class, white Protestant". What's "middle-class" about geometry or French or physics? The epithet is irrelevant to most of the curriculum. And to the extent that it refers to the values of the curriculum, there are good middle-class values and there are bad. And the worst middle-class values of all -- like commercial success -- were actually stressed by the old schools in melting-pot times. They were not stressed nearly as much in the schools in which I taught and still less in those that my children attended. And I think I'm one of the few people in a graduate faculty of arts and sciences who has taught on every level of the educational system of this country except the kindergarten.

And as for Protestant values, the erosion of religion from the curriculum of the public schools to a point where today even an innocuous prayer To Whom It May Concern is taboo, shows how far we have come. I didn't want to make these criticisms, but they made me make them.

I should like now to leave Mr. Taylor's paper and state some of my own views in telegraphic form on the question of quality and equality in education. I tried to work out the details of this in the second edition of my EDUCATION FOR MODERN MAN, but I don't think many more of you read that book than read the papers of this conference.

Democracy in education entails not a belief in the equality of human talent but rather commitment to an equality of concern for every child in the community to develop himself as a person with matured powers. There is a fundamental confusion in the attempt to base the policy of democracy in education on alleged facts of intellectual equality or to contest it on the ground of intellectual inequality. The normal variation of capacities in children is morally irrelevant to whether they should all enjoy the equality of our communal concern. But such equality of concern does not require equal educational treatment. Unequal educational treatment, like unequal medication treatment, is sometimes justified when required by the necessities of intellectual and emotional growth in each case.

Recognition of intellectual differences is not anti-democratic unless intelligence becomes the principle of differentiation in a graded, hierarchically organized society. No matter what the principle of social differentiation is, if it involves hierarchy, official or unofficial, it involves the opportunity and the likelihood of exploitation.

For reasons which cannot be expatiated on now, we face a developing situation in which it can be safely anticipated that attendance at college -- I hesitate to college education -- will be, if not universal, as widespread as secondary education today. And the nub of the problem is this: if we pursue the goal of excellence in education can we fashion a meaningful educational curriculum whose legitimate demands will not be beyond the reach of a sizable portion of our youth? The facts of biology cannot be blinked; they do not depend upon our political prepossessions, and they may defeat our aspirations if too unrealistic. Even today some of my colleagues report that the entire level of academic achievement in all but a few select colleges is sinking. Good fellowships are going begging, because people are not qualified to take them. Graduate Students of marginal capacity are being offered professorial posts in places which in the past would never have considered them.

Now, I believe a great deal can be done by special programs of coaching and other measures to reduce the disparities in educational readiness, but the differences in capacity will remain. And if we seriously expect to enroll most of our youth in colleges, including the group -- call them the less-bright group -- which no culture in the world has ever taken beyond bare literacy, we must plan our curriculums in such a way that they do not imperil the education of those who are not less bright, but bright and very bright.

As democrats we believe that every child, not only the one starred for excellence, but the one that's not so excellent, has the right to be educated to the full reach of his capacities. If students can significantly profit by some instruction, we have no justification to deprive them of the opportunity of continued schooling. But these two propositions do not entail the view that all students must study the same things in the same way and to the same depth.

The paradox is that as existing colleges are striving to raise their standards of performance and achievement -- and most good liberal arts colleges now consider themselves as preparatory schools for graduate school, as this is taking place, raising their standards both for admission and graduation, the number of those pressing for entry into colleges increases.

There is no one panacea that I can find to meet the situation. We can open the doors of the college to anyone with a high school diploma, and give a high school diploma to any child with staying power, but we must organize more than one type of curriculum, diversify the degrees granted, introduce programs leading to special certificates of distinctive merit that will enable students to begin their vocational experience at an earlier age than their differently endowed and more gifted brothers and sisters who must prepare themselves sooner or later for a living, too. There is still a great deal of snobbism about vocational as distinct from professional education in liberal arts colleges. But until the necessity for earning a living disappears, there can be no reasonable objection, so long as the basic objectives of general or liberal education are not jeopardized, to using the schools to prepare onself for a good living as well as for a good life.

But the future situation promises to be more difficult for reasons which Commissioner Allen indicated in his opening remarks. Our technological revolution, the consequence of what Whitehead calls the most revolutionary discovery in all history, namely, the method of the method of invention, may, in the future, erode the necessity of earning a living by making the brains of mediocre human beings vocationally obsolescent. The age of automation and applied nuclear energy, according to my good friend, Abba Lerner, may produce a world in which work becomes a privilege rather than a necessity. The Utopia described by Oscar Wilde is not yet on us, but it is in view, and that is a Utopia based on slavery, the slavery of the machine to man.

Now, the coming obsolescence of all but managerial and inventive functions by a route that neither Marx nor Veblen nor Dewey anticipated actually restores to a central place in schooling, it seems to me, the ideal of Greek liberal education. These ideals presupposed that free men are concerned with the pursuit and enjoyment of ends, of consummatory experiences, and not with the means and instrumentalities which were relegated to the provenances of slaves. These ideals supposed that the vocation of a free man is active citizenship, not earning a living.

In the economy of the future, if present trends continue, even John Dewey's noble ideal to eliminate the dualism which existed in industrial society between "earning one's living" and "living one's life" becomes irrelevant in fashioning an educational curriculum. For all of Dewey's faith in the revolutionary consequences of science, the realities far outstripped his expectations. And that is why, it seems to me the only section of Dewey's immortal work, which is still very relevant to our concern, DEMOCRACY AND EDUCATION, the only section which is obsolescent today is Dewey's discussion of the key place of vocation in education. And at the time that he wrote this, in 1916 when his book was published, his assumption that the education of the high school would necessarily require organization around vocation. And if we read that today, we see that it isn't relevant.

In a world which is genuinely a welfare economy, in which poverty is marginal or has been wiped out, how can education help human beings to develop a center around which to organize their experiences so that they can live a rich and meaningful life? This is the ultimate issue and challenge to those of us who believe that the existence of leisure, which grows with the decline of the length of the working day, makes all the more necessary emphasis upon significant educational experience.

Now, the challenge to this view was expressed by T. S. Eliot in his well-known essay on MODERN EDUCATION AND THE CLASSICS in 1932, in which he criticized the development of mass education for an elite. I quote from that. "The uneducated man with an empty mind", he ways, "if he be free from financial anxiety or narrow limitation, and can obtain access to golf clubs, dance halls, gaming tables and race tracks is, for all I can see, as well equipped to fill his leisure contentedly as is the educated man." For T. S. Eliot, the problem of education in leisure was no problem at all.

If T. S. Eliot is right, we need not concern ourselves with education of the mass society of the future, but leave it only to those few who have a special calling. But I do not believe that Eliot is right, and this for many reasons. There is time to state only one.

In modern society, intelligent citizenship, without which democracy is a myth, cannot be exercised where leisure is filled with the types of pastimes he describes, which are mainly ways of killing time. Intelligent citizenship in a democracy rests ultimately upon the spread of education, because it can serve as a powerful support of political freedom -- and this was Jefferson's insight.

The issue between T. S. Eliot and those who disagree with him is fundamentally over the desirability and viability of the democratic way of life. If men are in some way to govern themselves as well as others, whether they do it ill or well depends, among other things, on what they come to know through education about the world, society and themselves.

DISCUSSION
by
Martin Mayer

As far as Dr. Taylor's paper is concerned, I think I have some of the same objections that Professor Hook has. The bottom dropped for me, however, with the sentence about there being no line between playing music and appreciating music. As a part-time music critic, this bothers me terribly. What you are saying is that you regard both of them as good. You draw a circle around them and they are both good.

But if you had written playing and listening, and you said there was no way of drawing a line between playing and listening, you wouldn't be able to take yourself seriously, because anybody can see that there is a line between playing and listening,and appreciation is simply a literary form of listening.

And I think that this sort of problem, which is what Professor Hook was complaining about, too, this business of lumping together things that we think good as being in the same category for that reason, is what has bothered me.

I feel very badly about saying some of this, because Dr. Taylor has been kind to me on various occasions and I like to think that we fight basically on the same side. Specifically, we have been joined in opposition to Dr. Conant's Booker T. Washington approach to Negro education. We joined in opposition to the rage for standardized tests. We both worry about meritocracy. We both find it much harder than Professor Hook seems to find it to define or to delimit this word "intelligence." We both feel that the very bright can probably take care of themselves and that they are not, probably, the concern of the school system which is, by and large, not going to be staffed with very bright people.

Neither of us has Professor Hook's great interest in the size or the nature of the certificate which the bureaucracy awards the child for his persistence in taking all the damn tests that he is being given. And perhaps most important of all, we both feel that we are in a taste business and not in a science business. Both Dr. Taylor and I worry about this baselessness attitude which one does find in people.

But, really, I think that the worry about baselessness is a worry for Professor Hook and for Dr. Taylor and for myself, and not for the school teacher who, after all, sees the faces and is not nearly so far away from all of these things as those of us sitting in this room.

With all of these agreements -- and I think we have many -- I don't believe that what's in the paper is very useful. I think it starts with myths and with very big words. If we start from here, we risk chewing on cotton candy all the way, arguing meanwhile about our definitions. I feel what I consider the same myths in some of the other papers, too, and I'd like to pin some of them.

First, I'd like to jump a little on the place where Professor Hook says that Dr. Hutchins and he and Dr. Taylor and Professor Bestor are in agreement, this business of mass culture, a phrase which I must say I find beyond sensible definition, and I have been through this and out the other side on a number of occasions -- the idea that this somehow is the product of the devil, mass media in the advertising agencies, and that it does not tell us something, some of which is pretty frightening and some of which is pretty good, about the democracy itself.

In the other papers this attitude toward "mass culture" appears as a feeling that we are all being smothered in the goo from the pot boiling. I think this is demonstrable nonsense.

I think that the range of artistic and intellectual activities available to the average American is greater than it has ever been here or elsewhere at any time. The mass media in the advertising agencies are not devils; they are feed-back operations and they reflect with pretty good accuracy what majority taste amounts to, and majority in fact is not so bad as majority taste used to be. And nobody in this country is condemned to live with this garbage alone.

Incidentally, I feel no compulsion to criticize those who watch commercial rather than educational television. Among other reasons, I think they are probably getting the best of a bad bargain. I find you don't have to watch it at all. And I find it interesting, also, that most adolescents don't watch it.

Related to this false values business is the notion that the people of the country are starving educationally. This is one of the great fallacies and a very bad one, because it tends to misdirect attention. In fact, we have increased our expenditures on education from 4 percent to 6 percent of the gross national product in the years since the time right after the war -- 7 percent of the net personal income. We are now spending $20 billion a year more than we spent shortly after the war. It is one of the great accomplishments of this society and no service that I can see has been done to anyone by proclaiming the people of this country don't care about education. They may not care much about learning, but, by golly, they care about education.

Now, the money is most unequally spread. There are large stretches of this country where we face disasters unless considerably more is spent on the schools. Unfortunately, Dr. Taylor singles out New York City, which is not one of them. New York spends 10 percent of its net personal income on education right now; 6 percent on the public elementary and secondary schools alone, with 30 percent of the pupil population in private and parochial schools, and with a very extensive system of public and private universities on top of it. During the last four years expenditures on the New York City public schools have risen about $300 million. And the per pupil expenditure in the Harlem schools is now about as high as that in most of the New York suburbs, and higher than that in any suburbs I know outside the New York Metropolitan area.

The New York example is important for two reasons: first, as a demonstration that money alone doesn't get you very far; and secondly, as an example of the great danger of allowing school people to plead poverty as an excuse for not getting their work done. Until somebody puts his foot down and tells the New York schools that they could do a lot better job with what they now have -- the State tried it a few years ago, but unfortunately got dissuaded from saying it in public at the last minute, as Dr. Allen can testify -- I don't think anything of any great importance can be done in New York.

It is a matter, I think, of the most vital significance not to identify our problems with money, because you will get more money. You are not going to get an enormous amount more in a place like New York, because as the particle approaches the speed of light, it gets to be heavier. And there is an awful lot coming into New York now, but you are going to get a lot more elsewhere.

The important thing is not to let it go down the drain the way it goes down the drain in New York, and not to take New York as an example of an impoverished school system, when it has 30 percent more money per pupil than Chicago has, and it's very hard to see the difference when you visit the two systems. Apart from the three or four pupil difference in class size, what differences there are in view, I am afraid I would have to lean toward Chicago.

Now, this also comes down on mobilization for youth, which is a great accomplishment, and they got $13 million. I dislike the people who have been attacking mobilization just as much as Dr. Taylor does. I think they are a bad lot. But that doesn't mean that we have to admire mobilization. What they have been given amounted to several hundred dollars a family in the district they were working in. I don't think anybody can go down there and look at it and not have the feeling that we'd be a lot better off if that money had just been give to these poor people and not thrown down on social workers.

I felt very strongly with Professor Hook about the myth of the good old days, but I think there is a further relevance to this. I think the poverty program was predictable a few years ago -- I said so on a few occasions -- on the basis that the generation that was young and peppy in the twenties was about to pass out of controlling position and the one which looked back to youth in the thirties was about to take over. Now, I was a child in the thirties. So far as I can find out, they were horrible. I am not particularly edified by the spectacle of an intellectual elite looking back happily in the name of democracy to a time when they were cheerful because they felt they were leading a great movement and the mass of the population were wretched.

I also feel, frankly, that what has been accomplished in getting some money through the Poverty Program has not by any means been matched by the quality of thought that has gone into the ways in which the money is to be spent. Right now most of the time seems to be going into drawing up rules and regulations for the program, to guarantee that not a hell of a lot can be done with the money. And I am not dazzled, on the basis of what I have seen, with what Mr. Shriver or Mr. Wirtz or Mr. Moynahan or Mr. Yarmolinski seem to be coming up with educationally. Perhaps Dr. Ianni has seen better things recently, but up to the last time I took a look at this, they seemed pretty bewildered.

Now, it's a bewildering problem, but I don't think that we have to admire them just because they can get money. Somebody's going to have to think of some things to do.

Dr. Taylor also backs behind the thirties to idealize an alleged "traditional American aim to give every child an education suited to his talents." As I read the books, I see no reason to believe that the U.S. educational system ever came any closer to this aim than it does today, which is pretty far away.

There is also the commencement address business. Middletown poor did not, as I recall my reading, benefit all that much from going to the same schools with the rich, and the schools which dealt with the immigrants were unspeakable as Professor Hook has just mentioned, and by all the evidence that comes to us.

The Dewey section bothers me a little, too, not only because people who disagree as strongly as Professor Taylor and Professor Hook can both claim descent from Dewey, though this is itself a very severe criticism of Dewey's work.

I think the attacks that have been made on Dewey are scandalous, but I think we also have to face rather sadly the fact that with the passage of time, Dewey seems less significant when set against a James or a Pierce or a Whitehead or even a Russell. Anyway, Dewey was never a ponderable influence that I have been able to find on U.S. education. The influences were Thorndyke and Kirkpatrick -- the first saying it was science, and the second saying it was easy.

Another problem with the paper and with discussions I hear from people with whose goals I normally agree is the business of the malificent military. Now, none of us like militarism, we're all Americans, but I don't see how anybody can make any sense of the current American scene without noting the enormous importance of the desegregation of the Armed Forces. Moreover, the greatest educational effort in our history was accomplished by the military during the years of World War II and it was an effort that's spilled over into the colleges, with help from the G.I. Bill in the years thereafter.

Incidentally, Dr. Taylor's idea that the colleges were of much use in this effort seems to me a misreading of history. I was there at the time. The Army Specialized Training Program, which was all around me, was the most obvious infantry reserve I had ever seen, and, in fact, the moment the Army needed them in Africa or Europe, the Army pulled them right out of college and sent them in to be shot. But on an educational level, the military technical program was head and shoulders above anything we have ever done in vocational education.

The great tragedy of the post-war period, I think, for the Negro and for the poor at large has been the closing of the gates of the Army to those who scored below a certain mark on a standardized test. I think we ought to see how we can use this existing institution, rather than simply strike out at it as something we don't like.

I am no happier than Dr. Taylor or Professor Hook is with what they and President Eisenhower called the military-industrial complex. I think we'd better recognize that not much of that $50 billion budget could be made available to schools.

The defense establishment, directly and indirectly, takes six million people off the job market -- maybe it's a little more; Professor Harris would know. And most of what would be released if we cut down this particular budget would have to go to employing the people, and most of them would not be employed in educational capacities. Hopefully, there would be sufficient increase over a period of time in gross national product to give us something we can tax. But we aren't talking about the possibility of simply shifting $50 billion from defense into education. The world doesn't work that way.

There is the problem of cultural democracy which bothers me a great deal in much of this, and I think there is no phrase so awful, as hard-nosed, so I'll use it. We have to be hard-nosed about this sort of thing. Dr. Taylor talks of the culturally deprived in the suburbs who are deprived because they never meet kids from the Negro slums. I think this is pernicious nonsense. The important thing is that they can if they want to and, indeed, as he's been saying, there are kids in the colleges and in the high schools and in this liberal community who are doing so. The difference in the freedom of motion of these kids in the suburban high schools and in the colleges and the freedom of motion of the kids in the Negro slums and in Mississippi is so striking and so enormous.

What you talk about when you talk about deprivation is basically a loss of freedom of motion. But I do not think that anything that seems to equate these makes any sense at all, even though it's nice to think so and it's very nice to say so.

And more general, for God's sake, let us admit openly that certain cultural patterns are functional and certain cultural patterns are disfunctional in a modern industrial society. Any attempt to do something about the schools that tries to cherish all cultures equally will not convince anybody and will not get anywhere. It isn't the business that we are in.

Now, with all of the horror of the schools that Professor Hook talks about, that was their great strength -- their massive ethnocentricity. The aim was to pull arrivals into the mainstream of an existing society. Once there, as it turned out, they could and they did change it; but they got there. The Negroes have the right to get there, too. People who insist on reject rejecting the society on behalf of the Negro are not, in my observation, speaking for any sizable community. Negroes are entitled to get into this society and then reject it for themselves. And if they do get in, they will probably make changes. I hope they will and I think they will. But it's theirs to do and not the social critic spokesman.

Right at the moment, in my observation of the few I know, they don't want a brand new society. They want theirs. They are entitled to theirs. Sentimentality over what they will lose does them and the Puerto Ricans and Indians no good at all. A little honest work on which community habits must be disturbed and which may survive if the children become more competent than their parents would, I think, be valuable, but I don't see much of that being done. It would be a hard job.

Ultimately, in any event, and this is my fiercest disagreement with Dr. Taylor and my closest agreement with Professor Hook, understanding is no substitute for competence. Let the schools do better than they do now with the academic end and the social end is going to be a lot less hard to wrestle with.

There is also this business of the idealist community of the young people in the universities. Well, I like them, too, and I admire them. I admire the boys who went down to Mississippi. But I want to put in a little caveat. I know no group that is more certain to trample on my rights and liberties than the group which is devoted to the public good. Let us be very carefully, generally, about the extent to which we make everyone a sitter.

Dr. Taylor is usually on my side here. We both believe in diversity, but the experience of the thirties, I think, betrays it.

A Jesuit in the teaching business told me recently that he was unhappy at the notion that there were only two possible attitudes for the modern world, one of intense selfishness and the other a flaming martyrdom. We must develop something else, really. Frankly, as a practical matter, I don't know which hurts us more in New York right now -- the organization that is all for busing white kids up to Harlem or parents and taxpayers, the bunch which is a hundred percent against doing anything for the desegregation of the schools. Both have been enormously harmful. I would not be surprised if, really, "equal" has been more harmful over the course of the last year.

Moreover, if Dr. Taylor looks carefully at these new curricula which his friends have been making and teaching in the slums and in Mississippi, I think he will be horrified at the distortions and the dishonesties that they contain. The fact that people are doing something that we regard as good, we are on their side, does not deny the need for intellectual honesty in the approach to the problem. Yet I honor Dr. Taylor for the two traps he avoids, and they are hard traps to avoid. First, the idea that the school cannot move by itself, and secondly, the bogus scientisms of education. I think both of these must be firmly rejected, as Dr. Taylor seems to reject them.

That the school is a kind of inertia machine is quite obvious. But there are more powerful machines around, and it can be moved. Much, too much, of the current discussion seems to assume an unchanging school, and to concentrate either on pre-school work, which will be out of these guys' hands, or on manpower retraining, which we can also do away from that.

I am all for pre-kindergarten. I must say I profoundly distrust the Bloom and even the Deutschh and Bruner research which so drastically contradicts so much recorded human experience and which so neatly fall into the folds of newest fashion in behavioral science. Somebody quoted Wilder Penfield in one of these papers. I believe it might be worth remembering that Penfield also argued a few years ago toward the physiological necessity of teaching foreign languages before the age of ten. It just has to be nonsense, unless the Scandinavians are physiologically different from the rest of mankind.

In our excitement over the pre-kindergartens, which are important, particularly if they are handled well -- and I have every reason to believe that some of them are being handled well -- we run the risk of forgetting that the existing school program, matched with the existing home ambients, will wreck the graduates of the best such programs very very quickly.

This is not a puzzle where the intrusion of one new piece will make it come out right. There is no magic catalyst, if I may use the word in the presence of Dr. Friedenberg, who knows I know no chemistry. We need new leadership. We need new organizations. We probably need new school hours. We need new ways of running schools. We need new programs desperately.

One of the things that Dr. Taylor points out and that he quoted earlier, though oddly enough he quoted from his version before he put his pencil on it and therefore changed its meaning, it's right in the version you have, is the need for teachers who live in the neighborhood; not for children who have direct experience of the society, but teachers who have direct experience of the society. It's going to be hard. I am not talking about teachers who come out of similar neighborhoods, themselves. In my experience, no teacher is so rough on or so condemnatory of slum kids or so unwilling to experiment with something new as the teacher who pulled herself out of a similar hole. But we need people who are willing to have much more intimate contact with the lives of these kids than they have now.

I am not at all sure, incidentally, that we need massive sociological special preparation for the teachers who are going into these schools. Every time I see a slum teacher who seems to be getting a high order of response from kids, and I go and talk to her afterwards, I get a complaint that these kids are just like other kids, and there's an awful lot of fuss being made about nothing.

Now, what we are saying here really is that these teachers are doing something that works. Whatever sociological preparation you give the teacher coming into the slum school, if the program she is teaching and the way she is teaching it to these kids produces failure in the kids and therefore failure in herself, you are not going to get anywhere. All of your sociological training goes down the drain.

If you can give her a few things that will work, then you will change her attitude enormously and you will eliminate a very high fraction of all of the other things, and the culture shock and all of the stuff that we know about. The basic shock is that the teacher goes into the school and she fails. And after a while she hates it.

Most of all we need an attitude, we need a willingness of the school to blame itself for the failure of the children, not to blame the society for the lack of money or the parents or the children, without the belief that somewhere somehow the job can be done, without the knowledge that it is being done, without some models of the job being done, without at least an occasional experience of success for the person who is face-to-face with the problem.

And, incidentally, I don't think this is that hard, because what we have been taught to call the Hawthorne effect,would occur if we just kept trying new thi things on the grounds that the old things weren't working. All the other projects without this aren't going to help us much.

I do not share the usual American notion that the existence of what we like to call a problem proves the existence of a solution. But certainly the slum kids do not have to emerge from schools so useless as they do today. First things first. We are not trying to make an ideal school. We are not trying to change the world. We are not trying to build the new Jerusalem in this land of used car slag heaps. But we are trying to get some better fraction of children into shape to handle their future and not to be frightened of the world around them. And in all of this, if I may close with a shock, we must be as careful as we can not to specify our objectives in terms which kid us into the idea that we can accurately measure our success.

Dr. Shepard can, I suspect, speak of this more eloquently than I can. The standardized test is not a real god; it is a Ju-Ju. The big battalions are elsewhere. This is a subtle thing. Obviously, one must know something of what one is trying to do. Tests can be enormously valuable in telling you what you are doing -- more valuable for that, I think, than in telling you what the children are doing, but obviously they have values that can be used. But you mustn't insist on making what you can do something you can measure, and on determining what it is that you are going to do for these kids on the basis of whether we can measure it or not. And this is what specifying objectives normally means in the terms in which this dreadful phrase is used.

We are engaged in a wide enterprise. We gain certainty only by sacrificing breadth and variety, and by sacrificing validity. If we are to promote that tolerance of ambiguity, which is the great essential of learning and of teaching, we must be mature enough to tolerate great swatches of ambiguity in our own efforts.

I throw in the air, not for discussion, the idea that unless we are very careful, our immature behavioral scientists, with their belief in universal and necessary truths, long since discarded by the physical scientists, may handicap us more than they help us in the years to come.

I guess the flood of ideas which has been unleashed is pretty difficult to collect together, as far as a coherent reply or comment. If only one of these people had been speaking, it might have been possible. With both men releasing that flood of ideas, I'll content myself with taking them one at a time and saying the following.

I regret that Sidney Hook was forced to comment on my paper. And I am pleased to see that as soon as he got that over with, he got to his own paper in short space.

I think on my part it would have been unfair for me to have answered all the questions in the beginning to which this conference will devote itself. I felt a little modest about answering them all at the outset.

The function of my paper was to describe the polarities and tensions in the educational system. In doing so, I tried to locate the total context in which this discussion will occur, as we move to the specifics about what do you do about a given school, what do you do about a given curriculum. And I would say that in terms of your own positive statements, which I have had the good fortune to read in your book and your books and to discuss with you, I can agree with almost everything you said when you took off, in your own fashion, to describe your own beliefs and your own suggestions for the reform of education.

My concern for reducing diversity, within the curriculum and within the schools themselves, with the issues in society comes from a feeling based on a particular observation of kindergarten teaching, of elementary school teaching, of high school teaching, and the opportunity to be in teachers' colleges and see what is going on there. I find in these observations that the concern of the teachers are the

RESPONSE
by
Harold Taylor

I guess the flood of ideas which has been unleashed is pretty difficult to collect together, as far as a coherent reply or comment. If only one of these people had been speaking, it might have been possible. With both men releasing that flood of ideas, I'll content myself with taking them one at a time and saying the following.

I regret that Sidney Hook was forced to comment on my paper. And I am pleased to see that as soon as he got that over with, he got to his own paper in short space.

I think on my part it would have been unfair for me to have answered all the questions in the beginning to which this conference will devote itself. I felt a little modest about answering them all at the outset.

The function of my paper was to describe the polarities and tensions in the educational system. In doing so, I tried to locate the total context in which this discussion will occur, as we move to the specifics about what do you do about a given school, what do you do about a given curriculum. And I would say that in terms of your own positive statements, which I have had the good fortune to read in your book and your books and to discuss with you, I can agree with almost everything you said when you took off, in your own fashion, to describe your own beliefs and your own suggestions for the reform of education.

My concern for relating directly, within the curriculum and within the schools themselves, with the issues in society comes from a feeling based on a particular observation of kindergarten teaching, of elementary school teaching, of high school teaching, and the opportunity to be in teachers' colleges and see what is going on there. I find in these observations that the concern of the teachers and the general run of people who are talking about education and doing something about it is to deal with questions for elementary school children and for high school students in terms of implicit themes of the society. These themes are the product of a total culture context which makes the academic success of pupils in the school system the most important criterion by which we judge their ability.

Now let me be quite specific.

The City of Chicago has had the problem of Negro segregation ever since there was a Chicago. The last two or three years have been a time in which the City of Chicago is seething with concern on the part of the Negro, and on the part of a small group of educators, that the system itself is not functioning in any way which could meet the needs of the total population of the City of Chicago. The serious controversies which have involved the Superintendent of Schools, the teachers, the Board of Education, the entire structure through which education is dealt with in Chicago, has lagged greatly behind the real needs of the children in the City of Chicago. This is why it seemed to come as a surprise to the people in Chicago that the school system wasn't working properly.

This is specifically what I meant by saying that the problems as seen by the educators have been divorced from the problems of society. Why should the people in Chicago who run the educational system be so surprised that these issues are there? When you talk to the Negroes in Chicago, you find that it's only recently that they themselves have become concerned about their own issues; that mothers and fathers, but mainly the mothers, find that their children are not able to read at any kind of level appropriate to the stage they have reached in the school system. Then the educators deny that the statistics are valid. And the system of education is only moved toward facing its own issues by protest movements, boycotts, all sorts of overt manifestations of the laggardly way in which the educators themselves have dealt with these issues. That's what I mean about the discordance between the educational thinking and the changes in the society.

Mr. Mayer's absolutely right in saying that spending more money is not the answer to the problem of improving the quality of education. The spending of money is, of course, a necessary condition under which this quality can be achieved. But what I've argued is that the sort of program represented by the Poverty Program, which wishes to use Federal funds in order to deal with specific issues in the big cities and in the rural slums, were fast products created without thought for the continuity of their development by serious educational thinkers of the sort represented here in our conference.

I think one of the great virtues of this conference is that the issues are being confronted by informed persons whose research bears directly on the crucial questions.

Let me now comment on Mr. Hook's remark about the weakness of my paper in dealing with those changes necessary in the school environment in order to produce new reforms which are institutional in character and which must stem from the work of educators in dealing with every child in whatever the situation. What I meant by the improvement of the total environment is not to recapture a world which never existed in the school, but to do something which I have seen happen in school systems and in schools where persons in the 1930's and the '40's and the '50's addressed themselves to the reality of the situation of the children in the community. I mean that it is possible and desirable and necessary, to create within the school community that kind of model for a bigger society in which values of a personal sort including appreciation of the role of playing music and its effect on oneself esthetically, the necessity of involving oneself in the administration of the school as a student, the relationship between the teacher and the faculty, the consciousness on the part of the student that there are social issues going beyond himself to which he must pay attention. These are all factors which I consider necessary, and which I would be quite prepared in another session to spell out in some detail, in order to make the school in its community an instrument of social change rather than an acceptance of the social and personal values of the community surrounding the teachers, their parents and the children themselves. I took this to be an obvious point on which there would be general agreement. I was not trying to dodge the issues, rather, I was trying to describe this as an area where out attention has not been directed, and this runs right through the suburban high school, the suburban elementary school into the schools where there is less money spent, less attention of a personal kind paid to the student.

In my reference to the suburban school and the culturally deprived, segregated from the opportunity to experience directly the attitudes and values of a different culture, I was talking not simply about the opportunity for Scarsdale students to come into New York, or Harlem children to do out into the country. I don't conceive this as simply a transportation problem. I am talking about the reality of the suburban high school in American communities, where I have found students either bored with the curriculum because it is contained within itself, or oppressed by the necessity of making good in academic terms in order to enter college.

I do believe that it is most important to dissolve the walls between the school and the society. At the same time, I see no contradiction between relating, on the one hand, what happens in the schools to the issues in the society outside, and, on the other, the development of sheer intellectual competence, and personal appreciation of esthetic values, through which, in the long run, the society will be changed and the culture made a happier place for leisure as well as for work.

I apologize for having used the figure $30 billion for the space shot. It should have been five billion a year. The total allocation is in the amount of about $30 billion for the shot which will put a man on the moon before the Russians do.

I am not considering the usual cliches uttered about the military-industrial establishment. I found it difficult to describe that in short space without using those particular words. But it is a fact that there are economic and social forces, there is a power structure, no matter what terms we use, which has conditioned the response of the educators and the educational system to the necessities of the society.

Clark Kerr's definition of the knowledge industry is one which I think one must accept, in that we have developed an attitude toward knowledge which is, on the one hand, utilitarian, and on the other hand, consumer-oriented. Thus, if we think of knowledge-producers and knowledge-users, we find that knowledge-users are usually conceived in terms of the economic and social advantage of the user, not in terms of the enlightenment for the culture which the dissemination of knowledge could contribute. I am pointing to an attitude which, in the main sweep of educational thinking, accepts the notion that the educational system itself is a means through which the individual can move to social and economic advantage. And I defy anyone in this room to deny this as a common assumption in public discussion, whether it be at PTA meetings or at the meetings of educators when these problems are discussed. This is a common assumption too often made on the part of educators themselves as to what the function of education is.

And in bringing this up, I did not mean to fall into the trap of simply identifying a massive power, something which Mr. Eisenhower's speech-writers term "the military-industrail complex." I don't like that term. I think it is a cliche. I think it disguises more problems than it illuminates.

I am not trying to say that we must treat all cultures as equally valid. I am not trying to create a mixture in the old-fashioned melting-pot sense, and I don't think that I wish to be subjected to Mr. Hook's criticism that I am naive in thinking that back in the '30's there was this glorious feeling that we were to use education as the instrument of social change, that teachers were on fire to inject into the social system their own idealism. Nor am I prepared to say that in the present situation the integration of the cultures is an end in itself.

I did point out that the purpose of integration is to give to each child his sense of himself, his sense of belonging to a total culture, and a sense that he is going to make his own community. Let me be quite specific.

Mr. Mayer has referred to the distortions and dishonesties of the new curriculum developed by some of the young people who have gone to Mississippi. I don't find distortions or dishonesty there. I have worked quite directly with the young people who have gone down there. I have seen the new curricula they are developing in the Freedom Schools.

I have seen the institutes which they have developed in which they are involving civil rights workers in the study of the structure of politics, society and economics in the South. I find these quite enlightened, honest statements of what the structure of the South is, and how we can teach people who cannot respond to the academic curriculum the facts about their own society and their own stake in it.

Anyone who reads the mimeographed materials which some of these young people have developed for teaching drop-outs in the South and in the city slums will have to agree that this is neither distorted or dishonest material. This is new, fresh material developed by non-professionalsto deal with specifics. And I think if we had some of that attitude on the part of teachers in the big cities, who could work outside the big bureaucratic controls which exist in a city like New York or Chicago or Los Angeles, that we could have much more interesting and fresh materials to deal with. I think it is inaccurate to refer to these materials as being distortions or dishonesties of a new curriculum.

Finally, let me say quite specifically what I mean about the necessity of developing within the programs of teacher preparation new social attitudes. I could agree with everything Mr. Mayer said about the way in which teachers in New York City, Chicago and Los Angeles, simply to mention three cities sharing common problems, have been unable to cope with the problems in the classroom. And while I can agree completely that we must keep our objectives loose, and not talk abstract language about what the objective of the educational system is, I find Mr. Mayer's description about what can happen within the neighborhood schools a distortion of the fact.

Let me again be quite specific. On the south side of Chicago, there are college students and high school students who are teaching in the slums. They are doing the remedial reading things, they are teaching spelling, teaching algebra, they are teaching history. They are doing this out of a sense of duty, shall I say, out of a wish to move out of the particular parochial circumstances of their own lives into a larger community where the lives of the children whose circumstance they have been unaware of before give back to them some insight into what kind of lives they themselves were leading.

Out of these tutorial programs in the slums and in Mississippi have come a new kind of teacher, and out of the teaching the tutees themselves have then moved on to becoming tutors. Now, I see this as a variety of community development which is a necessary antecedent condition of creating a new attitude for teaching. And there is nothing more effective in the training of a teacher than to have him work with children unlike himself, and then to find that through his teaching he can develop in them those new tutors for the future who will then need more education in order to go on teaching. Some of the most successful tutors in the slums, from the northern student movement and from some of these new developments on the part of the college students, have come from those who, themselves, have been drop-outs and who have had their own problems to deal with, and therefore are better able to deal with the problems of other people.

I see as an inadequacy of the comments the refusal to accept a kind of primitive sense of idealism on the part of a new generation of high school and college students, some of whom are now preparing themselves to enter the Peace Corps, others who are the new recruits to be drawn into various kinds of domestic service corps, youth counseling and youth opportunity center staffs. There are more and more of these young people developing. That's what I mean by idealism. It's a motivation on the part of a new kind of high school and college sutdent whom we have not seen lately. And in those attributions to the life of the 1930's which have been considered both by Sidney Hook and Martin Mayer as being sentimental allusions by a guy ignorant of the situation, I would say that one does look back on the '30's with a sentimental liberalism which in a sense is unavoidable.

There were problems then which were hidden during the war years and in the 1950's. I say that these problems have now jumped into public consciousness for a variety of reasons, some of which I tried to describe here. But the fact of our relating the educational system to the social system is the main fact I wish to make. I will not defend here tonight my analysis of what was happening in the 1930's or in Sidney Hook's school 50 years age. I was referring mainly to their levelling and uplifting influence.

The lack of social context in educational thinking has

been apparent in public discussion of education. In those conferences designed to deal with the problems in economics and in the social system, I don't find the bite of informed intellectuals on the problem itself.

One of the reasons I feel that this conference is different from the others which have been conducted on these very problems is that the problems themselves are pointed to directly informed persons, whose research and personal experience bears on these issues. It's the absence of the kind of discussion we are having here, the kind of tough criticism which Sidney Hook and Martin Mayer have made of what I have had to say, which is lacking in the entire educational system.

ADDITIONAL QUERIES AND RESPONSES

Ernest van den Haag: I would like to ask whether I am interpreting correctly. When I hear the discussion of quality and equality, it seems to have come down rather squarely on the side of equality.

I think this is somewhat disguised by remarks about elite versus non-elite education. The word "elite" was here used, it seems to me, in a very equivocal meaning. Do you means, Dr. Taylor, that those who are more able to profit from learning should not be given the opportunity to learn more? This is what I though you might have meant by being opposed to elite education.

This is somewhat obscured, because it seems to me you don't make very clear whether you mean by "elite" those people who acquire a higher status, not because they have more opportunity to learn, or because they are more gifted, or more able to learn, but because of ascribed distinctions such as status.

To put it more specifically, don't you think that if we are to select people to go to a school of medicine or to study medicine, we should consider the people most gifted as future physicians first and most?

If we had an army, and we consider that in an army we need both officers and privates, don't you think that then we do need officers' schools, and that we will in a sense have an elite of officers? The schools should not be closed, but open to those who are gifted for the kind of leadership in the army or, for that matter, in a different form,in any profession in any society.

If I understood you correctly, you seem to be opposed to that thing. I think your position rests on a confusion of this sort of a need with hereditary or other kind of need. Let me add, of course, that the kind of opportunity for additional learning that would be involved, should not preclude our concern for those unable to profit from additional learning and that such education should be equal in many other respects. But as far as the strictly learning opportunity is concerned, are you really opposed to letting or helping the more gifted to learn more than the less gifted?

Harold Taylor: I'd like to respond to that on two levels. First, in my experience with students, the decision by a student, placed in the context of those who select him for further education, is usually one conditioned by cultural factors in his own environment. He wants to become an architect or a doctor or any one of other things for a variety of reasons, some of which are personal. I am arguing that our selection of those who are worthy of higher education demands a much more differentiated conception of quality than the one new current.

The one now current I find to be that of scholastic aptitude in a narrow sense. So that a good physician may or may not be one who is presently selected out by our kind of academic screening.

Let me relate that specifically to your analogy to the military services. Certainly there are those whose talents lie in a technical direction, and it would be foolish not to indulge the interests of those with the talents specifically designed for particular kinds of professions and occupations. But my experience in the Navy with the selection process of radar operators and officers indicated that most of the attitudes which the Navy took to recruits who could be moved into technical positions were culturally oriented rather than psychologically sophisticated. One of the tasks which I was privileged to undertake was to undo this fallacy.

It's that kind of experience directly with young people whose talents are as yet undiscovered which makes me believe that our major concern must be to adapt an educational system to the particular situation of each child or each 17- and 18-year- old at that crucial point in his own career where becoming a member of an elite is not his problem. Moving from his present situation into another one more advantageous to him and to his total aim is the problem which he has.

I used elite in a pejorative sense to identify our society's tendency to distinguish between a mass culture and another group of entrepreneurs and managers who run the mass. The selection process for those who are going to enter the managerial and entrepreneurial class is at present not designed to give advantages to those most worthy of them.

Van den Haag: What you are criticizing, then, is the present selection process, and I would agree with you it is something far from perfect. But you are not opposed to elite education, rather you are simply opposed to the way the elite is being selected at the present.

Taylor: Let me enter on the second level which you have spotted immediately -- the conception of an elite itself. It's a word that I think is risky to use, since it is very difficult in the American vocabulary to define it with sufficient precision to make it meaningful.

Let's use another word -- the selection of those qualified for further education whom we identify by their being in the upper 50% of their classes. As a corollary we exclude the lower 50%. My notion is that we should not prevent further development on the part of the lower 50% by screening them out, but rather should develop new forms of teaching, using whatever insights we have into the curriculum, into new materials which can take the whole entering freshman class from where it is to where it could go. At the present time the freshman year in many places is considered to be a screening device to l0se 30 to 40% of the beginning students on the grounds they weren't good enough to be there in the first place.

Now, it's in this context I am talking about the conception of an elite as referring only to those who have, at a given point in their lives, developed sufficient scholastic aptitude to be able to do the kinds of things which are done in what we call the quality institutions. This I consider to be a wrong-headed conception of what education is.

I believe the development of individual competence, intellectual interests, esthetic sensibility and sheer ability to handle ideas are among the major purposes of education. I don't make a distinction between greater and lesser degrees of the kind of talent which can variously be found among musicians or painters or sculptors or embryo physicians or architects. I find many ways of taking the raw material of a freshman class and, without having one conception of what talent is, employ a more differentiated conception of what quality in education is by adapting a new curriculum to whoever those people are. I think that would be my effort to answer your query about what the elite amounts to.

Sloan Wayland: I'd like to ask what "education" is referring to. Are we talking about higher education as well as schools? In Dr. Taylor's paper, and in many other papers, the focal point of attention apparently is on the school system. Now, I ask this question partly for clarification but partly because I am convinced that a generation age we could have focussed on the schools significantly without too much attention to college.

Today, however, it's a quite different kind of context, so that it's not possible any longer to talk about the school as if it were a separate kind of problem, not to treat the curriculum of the school as if it were a separate kind of problem from that of the college.

I think it would be of value for us to see whether in talking about quality and equality we are concerned about the whole educational system, or about the primary and secondary schools alone.

Taylor: I specifically wanted to address myself to the whole system, and that is why I used the term "knowledge industry", to cover a whole spread of ideas having to do with the orientation of the public school as well as the university.

Robin Williams: I thought the thrust of Dr. Taylor's remarks with reference to the elite and others was not so much what kind of teaching we held out to the ones who could do well but rather to insure that we did not deprive those who did not do so well. I saw the idea that we strive more imaginatively and we have to insure that we do not block off those who are not in some special class. I wondered if this is correct.

Taylor: That is what I was trying to do.

Arthur Bestor: Throughout your paper, Mr. Taylor, you seemed to be making a dichotomy between a concern with education defined in academic terms, in terms of academic disciplines, and an education which will be concerned with society and social problems. I think that's a fair statement of the element in the paper.

Now, is it then your judgment that academic scholarship today is not sufficiently attending to the current problem? Are sociology, anthropology, history and economics very much concerned only with professional problems, and unconcerned with the world? If this is the case, which I have my doubts about, where are the schools to get the guidance that is going to take them out into society?

If, on the other hand, you do feel that the academic disciplines today are concerned with social problems, why is it a fault to try to bring the curriculum of the schools up in accord with academic discipline thinking on social problems today?

Taylor: I think your first statement is closer to what I feel in observing high schools and colleges; that is to say, that the academic disciplines are more related to the problems arising within the hierarchy of academic subjects than it is to the substantive content of issues in the society itself.

I find in the curricula of the high schools no sense of relevance between the work in social studies and the bigger issues under which the disciplines can operate in order to answer certain questions.

The questions themselves, I think you would agree, change from generation to generation. I don't find the curricula in these areas adapting themselves to those changes and the different set of questions being answered by the disciplines. This is particularly true in philosophy, where, instead of dealing with those concerns which affect moral and social values, the philosophers within the universities are talking about the semantic issues, the linguistics and other issues not relevant to developing within the student a sense of intellectual inquiry or inducing some of the values which are required if students are to develop what Mr. Hook referred to as a sense of democratic responsibility.

Now let me make a corollary statement in order not to be misunderstood. I have a terribly high regard for the sheer exercise of the intellect in difficult or easy materials. I have a great sense of concern that, within the reforms necessary in education, what we consider to be the scholarly disciplines are not considered as obstacles to the development of intellectual acuity. I prize rather more than a great deal of my colleagues in education that sense of relevance of the mind to itself, involving the sheer enjoyment of the exercise of the mind on difficult issues and the necessity of gaining a background of information and knowledge which can only be had by systematic study.

What I am concerned about is that at a given point the development of systematic knowledge about given areas within the curriculum has been pushed at students, without any sense of what they are ready for, what they can respond to, and on what level they can deal with the academic material. And it is very difficult to use the word "acadmic" as it is in the case of elite, without being misunderstood. Perhaps another word would be preferable. The systematic inquiry into various areas of organized knowledge is a key function of the schools and the universities. However, if those inquiries in those disciplined gathering together of bodies of knowledge are not done with some sense of relevance to what the major questions are, then they become quite useless and intellectually defeating on the part of students.

Marvin Bressler: We have been operating on the implicit assumption that equality is a useful goal. This is in fact what I believe.

At the same time, I would like to hear anybody or all of you discuss the sense in which this is true; that is, if equality is deemed desirable and inequality undesirable, it must be so in relation to either certain consequences or certain standards.

By what mandate of individual welfare or social function or ethical standards may we conclude that equality is a desirable goal to pursue?

Martin Mayer: Equality implies comparability in many of the areas of the things that we are talking about. You do have various mechanisms which enable you to reduce to baseless qualities what you are talking about. The most obvious is the market mechanism, which reduces everything to sums of money which are neutral and which are comparable. But if you are talking about the equality of a first-rate painter and a first-rate composer, you are not talking about anything that's significant or meaningful. And if you are talking about the equality of human beings, except in terms of an egalitarian income or the equality of souls, which becomes equally neutral in most people's hands, I don't think that you are dealing with anything that has a significance or a meaning.

What we are talking about, I suppose, is an equality of freedom of motion which is going to produce very unequal ends. It's supposed to produce unequal ends. We'd have a horribly dull existence if it did anything else. And the problem is that we operate in such a way as to give highly divergent freedoms of motion so as to yield very highly divergent estimates of quality. But the notion that you wind up with something so bland and mathematical and basically unpleasant as equality strikes me as a very unfortunate notion.

On the other hand, I wouldn't want to criticize the word, because almost any other word would be equally bad. If you use "equivalent", you are being pedantic. You would have something a little less objectionable as a word, but you would be one step closer to what we are talking about, I think, one step further away from the neturality that is implied in the word "equality".

Sidney Hook: I feel that is not very responsive to the question. In fact, I am bewildered by Mr. Mayer's answer. I think that this whole problem of equality is central; it isn't a matter of neutrality.

While we speak of the Negro revolution and we talk about the equality of opportunity, we mean something very important, something for which people are prepared to die.

Now, the meaning of equality in education is fundamentally moral and the genius of American education that distinguishes it from education everywhere in the world is our belief that every human being, every citizen is entitled to as much equality of opportunity as society can provide at a definite time. The aspiration is not altogether a guide to practice, but as our country developed, we have taken this ideal seriously, and it is involved with the whole question of elite education in the bad sense.

Years ago there were people who frankly said that they didn't care very much what kind of education the Negroes got or what kind of education the Jews got; they were interested only in the education or their own kind, their own class. And you can find other justifications besides the moral justification for emphasis upon equality in education, but this is fundamental. If you challenge this, then you are raising a moral question as to why equality of concern is preferable to special kinds of selectivity.

Let me put it this way in its perhaps most elementary sense. Parents in the family who are aware of the inequalities or the capacities on the part of their children are nonetheless equally concerned about each of their children -- the bright and the one who is not so bright and even the dull -- and no one is surprised at that, because we pre-suppose a feeling and an emotion of concern for all children.

Now, the democratic ethos really asserts that the same attitude that the parent takes to all of his children is the attitude that society should take to all it its children. You may regard that as naive and objectionable, but I think that's the basis of our commitment. And if someone wants to challenge that, then they must challenge it on some aristocratic notion. Very few people are prepared to do it on the basis of a pure principle of aristocracy. Even Plato maintained that through his educational system he was enabling all human being to find themselves in such a way they would have equal opportunity for happiness.

There is a tendency on the part of most people who reflect to accept the principle of equality of treatment as part of a theory of justice, so that when you treat people unequally, the burden of justification rests upon you. So that those who take issue with the democratic attitude in education would then have to offer some good reasons why we should treat some people unequally.

Judon T. Shaplin: Another element is our growing uncertainty about our ability to judge capabilities, at whatever age, and any kind of premature judgment that challenges a person in any particular direction. One of the things I sense in the immediate climate of the Negro revolt in the last couple of years, the emphasis upon pre-school, is an increasing uncertainty about this, and the growing realization of the way in which accidents of birth and early circumstance increase our uncertainty about knowing about children.

John W. Powell: I am increasingly disturbed by the sense that during the whole evening we have been talking about education in terms of the classroom curriculum and the educational testing service, whereas, we are actually talking about the future of a society.

One of the talents which the society requires, which is unpredictable and is demonstrably unrelated to marks in school, is the talent of leadership. No society can exist without leaders, no group exists without leaders. The talented leadership comes from what source we don't know. And yet every society will have leaders.

You know from your own experience that your best leaders in high school and college often come from your C-minus students and yet they will go on to be the nation's leaders. One very real question we have to deal with, then is how is the educational system going to see to it that the leaders of the nation are -- and we were very much for a while in danger of being in this situation -- that the leaders of the nation are not uneducated.

Hook: I thought you said that our leaders came from the C-minus students. Since we always have them, why should we worry about them?

Powell: Because we cannot afford uneducated leaders.

Hook: I'm a little suspicious of training for leadership in a democracy.

Powell: I mean how can you see to it that those who are going to be leaders are educated, not necessarily in terms of A's and B's?

Hook: Well, I could maintain that if you look at the presidents we have had, Truman and Eisenhower, you can make a good claim that you could just as well have election by lot in a democracy. And the Greek system of election by lot didn't work so badly, because they were all pretty well educated.

Powell: They kind of went under, I believe.

Hook: Yes, but not as a result of their education, because all cultures go under sooner or later, including our own.

Powell: Are we to take this for granted?

Hook: I think that if the second law of thermo-dynamics is valid, we can take it for granted.

Taylor: I'd like to shift to a technical question. The Soviet system of education makes extreme claims, as we do, for equality, and their system is organized under a 10- or 11-year program of free education. The technical means through which this concept of equality is applied consists of moving the children in the Soviet system through certain courses of study and through certain experiences controlled by the educational authorities, which are equal in the application. But their conception of equality is different from the one which I think is being advocated here, which adapts the educational system to the present situation of the people in a given community.

The thing that horrifies me is, if you go out to certain sections of the country and talk with the teachers in any given high schools, you will find that there is no national effort consonant with our claim to establish that adaptation of the educational system to the need for equality, which in our terms means a differentiated concept of quality at a given stage in the child's development.

What is needed at the moment is perhaps some more technical exercise in developing a conception of equality which doesn't fall into the fallacies which Mr. Hook is hinting at, which then deprives somebody of a chance to move through the social system, whether he is C-minus, A-plus, or whatever. And I believe if we keep ignoring these qualitative factors in the conception of equality, we are making a terrible mistake in that we are equating our system with a controlled system in which everybody will have to be equal, because they are all studying the same subjects.

Edgar Friedenberg: I've interpreted Prof. Bressler's raising of this issue as perhaps at least giving sanction to question the value of equality itself as always the paramount consideration or a dominant one when a choice involving a hierarchy of values has to be made.

I must say that comparatively few things that have happened to me that turned out to be agreeable or lucrative were ever done in the name of equality; quite the contrary as a matter of fact. And whether I wanted to favor it would depend on what one was being equal about, and what seemed to be lacking or needed in a social situation at a particular time. I don't think you can very sensibly be in favor of almost any value. I can think of none in which you can say, "Well, no matter what condition society is in, what problem it is facing, it's always going to need more this one". I think most of the time in history and most of the societies in which one might have lived has quite easily taught too little application of the principles of equality in most situations.

At this time I'd want to think of its countervailing in whatever I was dealing with. I am concerned, too, about there being no opportunity, unless there is meant to be, of asking the price of a particular value, even if you do agree that it is good. Equality in a particular educational context night still cost more of other things that I am trying, and I would be willing to relinquish and I am quite sure that it is true in a great many educational situations.

Taylor: Would you give an example of what you mean?

Friedenberg: Specifically, in curriculum I dislike having to work with materials that are made intelligible to a large number of people at the cost of what seems to me to be loss of meaning. I write enough for a variety of editors to know that in principle this principle is scarcely questioned. In society people can say, "Yes, I understand, but, by trying to be so subtle, you are simply putting it out of the reach of a large number of the people you might be writing for." All I can say is that is indeed one of the unfortunate consequences that I am prepared to accept.

What I really want is to say what I mean to whoever may happen now, or if the record is preserved, later, to be along who might understand it.

Hook: Aren't you confusing equality with the quantitative?

Friedenberg: No, I don't think so.

Hook: Well, the illustration refers to the quantity of the people. I could understand a written-down version of what you wanted to say, and I can't imagine any editor asking you to abandon your subtle expressions on the grounds that you were treating people unequally.

It is true that the term "equality" as a value by itself is never sufficient. It's quite clear when we say we can treat people equally that we can also mistreat people equally, and therefore there must be something else besides the equality of treatment. Usually equality as a value, as a social value, goes hand in hand with something which you may call social welfare or human happiness, and there are occasions in which justice will conflict with happiness.

But as far as education in concerned, you can't state everything. We presuppose a whole background here. When we talk about educational equality, we really mean broadening the opportunities for individuals who have been unfairly neglected or ignored.

Let's take an analogy in other fields to see this. When we speak of political equality in any particular context, we say "Now, we want not only ment to vote, we want women to vote. We want not only white men to vote but all men to vote". The assumption is that citizenship or the political aspects of the situation are such that we have approved them upon reflection, but the irreducible element of justice remains. That is to say, every child has a right to the development of his capacities.

Friedenberg: I don't want all men to vote. I don't want them to be restrained from voting, but I am delighted when they lose their way to the polls very often.

Hook: But you don't want to deprive people from voting, do you?

Friedenberg: No.

Hook: That's the important thing when we speak of the political equality. They should have the right to vote, all men should have the right to vote.

Mayer: I think we are coming back to what I was objecting to, that equality and diversity are in a sense logical antagonists and that you simply have to live with this. Certainly Prof. Hook does not propose to give equality of treatment to the youngest of the Rockefellers and some poor kids in the slums. Because their situations are diverse, you don't have equality of treatment. You have to do something else. Nor are we talking about putting them both through the Harvard Graduate School unless they have some aspect in which they are not diverse.

In talking about equality and justice, then, there is a very great danger of getting so far up in the air that you can't see what the animals are eating down below. We are very concerned here, I think, with the promotion of diversity and with the fact that people are very different from each other, and what equality means in this context is something very, very tricky and not easily to be taken into real terms. It always winds up on a very high plane.

Hook: May I respond to that? I think this is crucial, even though it involves a philosophical issue. See, this presupporition that equality entails uniformity or identity is what I am arguing against. In fact, what I am saying is that the moral meaning of equality, where human beings are concerned, is an equality of difference, that Negroes and whites and Jews and Gentiles are different, and we don't want to eliminate all these differences so that each one becomes shiningly indistinguishable from each other.

What we oppose to the melting-pot concept and 100% American concept is the assumption that equality involves a uniformity and identity and then a mediocrity. We say people can be different, human beings have different needs, but each one has an equal right to have his specific needs taken into account. The genius of modern education, as distinct from the past, it seems to me, is the awareness that education in some way must take account of the needs of the learner and to present what is desirable in the way of education to him in such a way that he grows with this material.

Seymour Harris: A few economic points. I think we have had bad economics here so far. I think that Prof. Hook needn't worry about the time when we will have to pay to do some work. I think he exaggerated this problem of automation and technology. I think most people in Washington say there have been no great changes in recent years, so I don't mean to say there aren't any problems here.

Now, in Mr. Mayer's discussion, the whole economic issue was rather minimized. I don't for one minute believe you can have a good educational system only by getting cash. If you put out more cash, you have to get more supplies or resources if you are going to do a good job. But I don't for one minute believe that it isn't important to get some cash.

There's been a tremendous increase in the amount of money spent on education, if you put on a per capita basis the number of people who are being educated, you will find an entirely different result. As a matter of fact, for example, in higher education, if you compare the amount of money spent per student with the rise of per capita income in the nation over a long period of time, you will find that actually the standards of higher education are considerably deteriorated in relation to what has been happening to the economy.

Mr. Mayer also said that we shouldn't try to measure the net results of education, that this is a silly thing to do.

I am not so sure, but I wish we could measure the results. A number of studies showed that Harvard, Yale and Princeton alumni had much higher incomes than alumni of other colleges. I would suggest that Harvard, Yale and Princeton do a wonderful job on their education. Although as one of the editors of the Harvard Crimson said when I suggested tuitions ought to go up, he said: should tuition go up because Mr. Harris says that Harvard education will give you so much income? And Prof. Harris says that the Aga Khan gets a million dollars' worth of income because he went to Harvard. That's not my position.

I did want to say when Mr. Taylor said something about the fact that we haven't solved our problems of distribution, unemployment, full production, poverty and so forth, I think that isn't exactly correct. I think we have done a great deal in these areas. This is a highly prosperous economy, with only 3% of the heads of families unemployed; and of all people who are unemployed, one-third of these people are only seeking part-time jobs. The unemployment problem isn't nearly as bad as people make it out to be, It is an important problem, but not nearly so bad as what Mr. Taylor has written.

Now a word about the tests. I don't think that the experts on tests aren't aware of the difficulties of tests. I am not sure they depend so much on tests as Mr. Taylor says they do. I know at Harvard they pay much more attention to what a student does in school, his grades, in school, and so forth, and what the principal says about him. But I also want to remind you of something that John Gardner says about testing in his brilliant book on excellence. He said he can remember the time when teachers judged their students by how much steak they had on their fingernails, or what their accent was. The introduction of tests did a tremendous amount to bring about fair treatment of students, and we mustn't forget that.

Part II THE COSTS OF QUALITY AND EQUALITY IN EDUCATION

"The Economic Costs of Quality and Equality in Education"
Seymour E. Harris 1 - 12

"The Social Costs of Quality and Equality in Education"
Robin M. Williams, Jr. 1 - 25

"The Psychological Costs of Quality and Equality in Education"
Urie Bronfenbrenner 1 - 15

Part III "Quality and Equality in American Education: A Partisan Essay"
Melvin M. Tumin and Marvin Bressler 1 - 49

Part IV SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 1 - 30

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

James E. Allen, Jr.
Commissioner of Education
State of New York

Norton L. Beach
Professor of Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

Arthur Bestor
Professor of History
University of Washington

Marvin Bressler
Professor of Sociology
Chairman
Roger Williams Straus
Council on Human Relations
Princeton University

Urie Bronfenbrenner
Professor of Child Development
Cornell University

R. Freeman Butts
Professor in the Foundations
of Education
Associate Dean for International
Studies
Teachers College
Columbia University

Oscar Cohen
Director, Program Division
Anti-Defamation League
New York

Martin Deutsch
Director
Institute for Developmental
Studies
New York Medical College
New York

Henry S. Dyer
Vice President
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey

John C. Flanagan
President
American Institute for Research
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Boris Ford
Dean
School of Education and Social
Work
University of Sussex
Sussex, England

Edgar Z. Friedenberg
Professor of Sociology
University of California at Davis

James J. Gallagher
Associate Director
Institute for Research on
Exceptional Children
University of Illinois

Miriam L. Goldberg
Associate Professor of Psychology
and Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

Elizabeth Greenfield
Chairman
Committee on Quality Education
Member
Board of Education
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

Louis M. Hacker
Professor of Economics
Columbia University

Seymour E. Harris
Professor of Economics
University of California
at San Diego

Sidney Hook
Head
Department of Philosophy
New York University

Francis A. J. Ianni
Director
Division of Educational Institutions and Programs
Teachers College
Columbia University

Samuel A. Kirk
Director
Institute for Research on Exceptional Children
University of Illinois

Herman H. Long
President
Talladega College
Talladega, Alabama

John Henry Martin
Superintendent
Mt. Vernon Public Schools
Mt. Vernon, New York

Martin Mayer
Author
New York

John J. McKenna
Superintendent
Township Board of Education
Princeton, New Jersey

Barbara McNeill
Program Analyst
Bureau of Research
U.S. Office of Education
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Washington, D.C.

Joseph Monserrat
Director
Migration Division
Department of Labor
Commonwealth of Puerto Rico
New York

John Walker Powell
Director of Curriculum
University of Miami

Fritz Redl
Professor of Social Work
School of Social Work
Wayne State University

Peter H. Rossi
Professor of Sociology
University of Chicago
Director
National Opinion Research Center
Chicago

David G. Salten
Former Superintendent of Schools
New Rochelle, New York
Director
Federation of Jewish Philanthropies
New York

Robert J. Schaefer
Dean
Teachers College
Columbia University

Milton Schwebel
Associate Dean
School of Education
New York University

Clarence Senior
Professor of Sociology
Brooklyn College
Member
Board of Education
New York City

Judson T. Shaplin
Director
Graduate Institute of Education
Washington University

Samuel Shepard, Jr.
Assistant Superintendent
Board of Education
St. Louis

Theodore R. Sizer
Dean
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University

Sydney S. Spivack
Research Associate
Roger Williams Straus
Council on Human Relations
Princeton University

Chester R. Stroup
Superintendent
Borough Board of Education
Princeton, New Jersey

Harold Taylor
Author and Educator
New York

Martin Trow
Professor of Sociology
University of California
at Berkeley

Melvin M. Tumin
Professor of Sociology and
Anthropology
Princeton University

Ernest van den Haag
Professor of Social Thought
New School for Social Research
New York

Sloan R. Wayland
Professor of Sociology and
Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

John F. White
President
National Educational Television
Association
New York

Robin M. Williams, Jr.
Professor of Sociology
Cornell University

Norman D. Kurland
Center for Innovation in Education
State Education Department
State of New York

INTRODUCTION

A fund-raising pamphlet, first issued in 1752, by the College of New Jersey, later Princeton University, begins with an affirmation that was even then common lore: "Nothing has a more direct Tendency to advance the Happiness and Glory of a Community, than the founding of public *Schools* and *Seminaries of Learning*, for the *Education of Youth*, and adorning their minds with useful Knowledge and Virtue." The evidence for this assertion presumably rested on "Daily Observation" that "evinces, that in Proportion as Learning makes its Progress in a Country, it softens the natural Roughness, eradicates the Prejudices, and transforms the Genius and Disposition of its Inhabitants. *New Jersey*, and the adjacent Provinces, already feel the happy Effects of this useful Institution."[*]

It is peculiarly appropriate that two centuries later Princeton should be the site of a conference whose theme "Quality and Equality in Education" implies that these "happy Effects" will not be diffused throughout the land until high quality schooling is equally accessible to all Americans regardless of creed, color, national origin, social class, or differences in talent. The achievement of this end is both a social necessity and a moral obligation that is not fully discharged by the national commitment to tax-supported, universal, compulsory education. The equal right to attend *some* school is merely a necessary but not sufficient condition for "equal educational opportunity." A more adequate definition of this concept would be attentive to the full range of variables in school and society that enhance or impede learning. There is no real parity when some children are systematically handicapped by environmentally induced social and psychological deficits or when the schools dispense high quality education exclusively to the academically gifted.

Recent research on the problems of the poor, Negroes, and Puerto Ricans leaves no doubt that the school system magnifies the inequities of a stratified society by offering some children superior education while denying it to others. Meanwhile, the mediocre or below average student from high income communities is victimized in a more subtle fashion. He is often publicly symbolized as a failure by a school that measures its own success by the proportions of its graduates accepted by prestige colleges. The result is in varying degrees similar in both cases: the individual child experiences a deflation of self, anxiety, and hostility. At the societal level, lack of educational opportunity severely restricts the positive functions of education as a mechanism for recruiting and discovering talent, as an agent for economic growth, as a vehicle for social mobility, and as an instrument for peacable social change.

---

[*] Gilbert Tennent and Samuel Davies, *A General Account of the Rise and State of the College, Lately Established in the Province of New-Jersey in America*, (London 1754), p. 3 quoted in Richard Hofstadter and Wilson Smith (eds.), *American Higher Education* (Vol. One), The University of Chicago Press, 1961. pp. 91-92.

Discussions about these matters have not always been responsible. During the "Great Debate" on education, the "critics'" overwhelming preoccupation with the problem of gifted children debased the concept of equality, while the "educationists'" seeming indifference to intellectual rigor violated the principle of quality. In view of these circumstances, it seemed urgent to convoke schoolmen and academics of diverse viewpoints, disciplinary affiliations and experiences for the purposes of identifying goals and suggesting the means of furnishing a high quality education for all. It was assumed that a rational strategy for dealing with these matters required that the work of the conference should be primarily oriented to general criteria and principles, while concrete "how to" problems should be postponed until more general issues had been satisfactorily resolved. Thus, for example, although much of the conference was devoted to the problems of "individualization of instruction," there was comparatively little discussion on the allocation of "class hours" to various disciplines, the appropriate sequence of cognitive development, and other technical questions of curriculum and instruction. Similarly, the urgency of integrating the schools was implied throughout, but there were no full-scale discussions on the pace at which it should proceed, racial ratios, the bussing controversy, and kindred matters.

The selection of specific topics within the context of the broader theme was guided by the conviction that, in its most fundamental form, education consists of a classroom, teachers, pupils, and a set of organized experiences that are designed to yield pre-selected outcomes. These include, at minimum, changes in knowledge, skill, values, and personality adequacy. However, the miniature social system of the classroom is connected through the school to a larger institutional complex that restricts its autonomy. In the most general sense, the classroom is influenced by the total characteristics of American society and the educational system. More specifically, activities within the school are importantly determined by the aims that society seeks to achieve through formal education, the human and natural resources it allots to these purposes and the means within the educational system that are selected to accomplish the desired ends.

These considerations suggested the adoption of the following agenda with the expectation that each topic should be considered in relationship to the main theme of "quality and equality in education."

I. "Polarities and Tensions in the Educational System"
Chairman: James E. Allen, Jr.
Paper: Harold Taylor
Discussants: Sidney Hook and Martin Mayer

The intent of this session was to explore such traditional yet living controversies as the excellence of the elite vs. the excellence of all; the conservation of values vs. the introduction of change; education for the "mind" vs. education for the "whole person."

II. "The Challenge of Group Differences
Chairman: John Henry Martin
Paper: Peter H. Rossi
Discussants: Martin Deutsch and Martin Trow

The emphasis in this session was on the anticipated, unavoidable, and permanent fact of diversity in the American population. Diversity arising in part from racial distinctions and differences arising in part from class differences are at present of greatest significance.

III. "The Challenge of Individual Differences"
Chairman: Henry S. Dyer
Paper: Samuel A. Kirk
Discussants: Fritz Redl and Milton Schwebel

This session was devoted to inter- and intra-individual variation and to those forms of diversity that are presumably "pathological" and susceptible to remedial action.

IV. "Education in the Social System: External and Internal Influences Affecting the School"
Chairman: Elizabeth Greenfield
Paper: John C. Flanagan
Discussants: Herman H. Long and Clarence Senior

The main concern of this session was to explore the range of influences inside and outside the classroom that affect the educational process. The emphasis was on the relationship between school and society, and on the internal structure of the educational system.

V. "The Content and Processes of Education"
Chairman: James J. Gallagher
Paper: Edgar Z. Friedenberg
Discussants: Miriam L. Goldberg and Samuel Shepard, Jr.

This session was designed to deal with the formal content of the curriculum, methods by which this content is transmitted, the role of evaluation in assessing the success or failure of these methods, and the role of research in the production of new knowledge and methods.

VI. "The Recruitment and Training of Schoolmen"
Chairman: David G. Salten
Paper: Robert J. Schaefer
Discussants: Judson T. Shaplin and Theodore R. Sizer

This session focused on the cultural values, social mechanisms, and institutional resources that affect the motivation, the training process, the development of appropriate roles and career histories of teachers and administrators.

VII. "Beyond the Twelfth Year: The Problem of Continuing Education"
Chairman: John F. White
Paper: John Walker Powell
Discussants: Louis M. Hacker and Ernest van den Haag

This session was based on the assumption that education should be a life-long process for all segments of the population. It considered the appropriate contribution of college, adult and self-education in achieving this goal.

Harold Taylor's keynote paper revealed the massive mood of discontent that was to characterize much of the conference. According to Taylor, the functions of the school should be defined by two features of contemporary American society: its "mass" character, and the requirements of democratic existence. The problem is everywhere to discover how to deal with huge numbers of people so that "each can share in responsibility for his own choices, each can be linked directly to the sources of political and social power, and each can be enhanced in the dimension of his personal growth." The Anti-Poverty Program, the civil rights movement, the Peace Corps, and the student movements are to some degree novel and welcome responses to this challenge.

However, according to Taylor, educational policy and practice has not been similarly responsive to the perplexities of contemporary life. One index of inadequacy is that the entire budget for education at all levels -- local, state, and federal -- is less than half of the combined expenditures for military purposes and space exploration. Such resources as do exist are not used to best effect. The schools have failed to recognize the needs of a democratic society by concentrating their efforts on limited functions and a selected segment of the population. The interpretation of education which is confined to the improvement of instruction in the cognitive sphere, while underemphasizing the psychological and social dimensions, has led to the development of a "standard curriculum adapted to a standard child who, when seen in action, turns out to be a middle-class white Protestant achiever." The schools have too often regarded themselves as manpower agencies that provide the trained cadre of "scientists, technologists, linguists, and others who can man the going organization." The high school thus becomes primarily a conveyor belt that is designed to transport young people to prestige colleges. Meanwhile, the academically average student and those victimized by low income, racial discrimination, and impoverished environments are neglected.

The result is a real danger that there may develop "two cultures with two educational systems designed to foster them, one for the masses, the other for an elite . . ." The products of both tend to be deficient in sensibility, self-knowledge, spontaneous life styles, and are content with a "television-watching, movie-going mass culture, the target of the social critics, and the delight of the advertising agencies." The solution rests in the mobilization of all the resources of the schools -- the spirit of social concern that motivated them in the thirties; the extension of such experiments as ungraded classrooms, remedial teaching, pre-school programs and the like; new teacher training programs -- to achieve genuine equality of opportunity in education. This may be defined, according to Taylor, as follows:

> Equality in its fuller sense means that at each level and within the particular situation of each child, education must be designed to deal with the child's situation, whatever it might be. Within the broader meaning of equality, quality of education is measured by how well it deals with the child's total development, how much it increases his capacity to think, to learn, to grow, to mature, to establish his own identity and his own usefulness to himself, to others, and to his society.

Sidney Hook and Martin Mayer, who discussed Taylor's paper, dissented from his analysis in numerous particulars. Both took issue with the strength of Taylor's emphasis on utilizing the school as an agency of social reform and his blanket indictment of middle class values. Each believes that the school makes its maximum contribution not by a direct onslaught on social ills but rather by indirection -- that is by developing imaginative, critical, well informed people. If the schools defined their function as the reconstruction of society, they would be undertaking tasks which they are not equipped to perform and that fall properly within the province of home, church, and state. They also agreed that it is important to distinguish between various kinds of middle class standards because some value commitments are demonstrably functional and others dysfunctional for living in a modern, complex, industrial society.

The discussants, themselves, were not in accord on at least one major point. Mayer detected a "logical antagonism" between "equality" and "diversity." Professor Hook, however, argues that this distinction confuses "equal" with "identical." Democratic theory recognizes that people differ in capacities and achievements but it insists on an equality of concern for all men. Thus, a school whose program makes due allowances for the individual differences of *all* of its students is at the same time demonstrating the compatibility of the concepts "equality" and "diversity."

Peter Rossi's paper deals largely with the group and categorical barriers to the achievement of quality and equality in education. Although he paid tribute to a number of the historical achievements of the American system of education including its generous political support for schools that have been remarkably effective in training talent, providing opportunities, and assimilating a heterogeneous population, Rossi was less sanguine about the capacity of education to deal with current challenges. The heart of the dilemma, as he sees it, is that it is no longer as possible to utilize persons of low educational attainment in the labor force with the result that the function of absorbing deprived groups "into the mainstream of American society has been largely allocated to education in a period in which small success will be judged as failure." These populations are characterized by "poor ability, [as measured by standard devices] scanty knowledge, and low levels of motivation, at levels of deficiency far below those 'normally' encountered in dealing with the 'standard' American school population." These differences have their origins in differential wealth and income, dysfunctional cultural patterns, and punitive psychological experiences. As Rossi points out:

> to be lower class and/or Negro in contemporary America is to know from a very early point in life that one is different from 'standard' American and different in ways which are devalued. This is the sense in which to be in such groups is to be continuously punished.

These historically conditioned disabilities result in apathy, aggression, a deviant value system, and an unstable family structure that perpetuate an unhappy legacy.

Rossi proposes two major forms of intervention. The first consists of "breaking the vicious cycle" by exposing children to supplementary experiences such as pre-school programs, "Higher Horizons" type projects, perhaps even neighborhood residential schools, and by enriching ordinary schooling by such measures as tutoring programs and imaginative use of volunteers. The second form of intervention involves introducing basic social reforms such as the establishment of a floor under income, changes in the stratification profile, and the extension of legal equality to everyone. In undertaking such action, society should be mindful of certain generally desirable characteristics that should characterize all programs of intervention, i.e. they should be 1) potentially capable of affecting large numbers of people, 2) involve manageable costs in human and natural resources, and 3) be capable of producing significant effects.

In commenting on Rossi's paper, Martin Trow indicated that the commitment to all forms of intervention was in large measure determined by an allegiance to the "strong" as opposed to the "weak" versions of equality of opportunity.

> The 'weak' concept, the traditional liberal view of equality of educational opportunity, would remove all external barriers, birth and wealth, which would handicap the transition of intelligence into academic achievement and then career achievement. In that view, intelligence is more or less fixed largely genetically, or at least treated as if it were so, and the demand is that able boys and girls of humble birth be given access to decent education . . .
>
> The 'strong' conception of equality of opportunity sees intelligence as achieved and calls for equalizing the opportunities for gaining intelligence. The demand is much more radical in its implications, since much of intelligence is acquired or aborted in the family. Thus this doctrine calls for quite active measures to help the family help its children, however much we are inclined to flee from those who

> come to help us, and further measures to supplement families' efforts through what might be called compensatory socialization. This is a commitment to help the child, despite the family's inability or indifference or, even, its active opposition. . .
>
> A basic difference between the weak conception of educational opportunity and the strong is the difference in the demands it makes on the schools for the success of the student. Under the weak conception, whatever else might have been said about it, the student's failure basically is placed on his own shoulders. Under the strong concept, the student's failure is seen as a failure of the schools or the teachers, and this is what people have been calling for from time to time, yesterday and today. This makes, of course, much severer demands on the school and teachers. I think it in part accounts for the new concerns for educational reform and for our search of ways to intervene in our search for levers.

The adoption of "strong" notions of equality would require extensive efforts to improve the quality of instruction and to alter the climate of teaching and learning. These would include differential rewards for teaching in difficult circumstances, the training of teachers in slum living, the use of some forms of programmed instruction, experimentation with different ratios of racial and class mixtures, and manipulation of the curriculum to encourage the spirit of intellectual adventure rather than boredom. We must also be prepared to examine the effectiveness of the structure of the school system itself, particularly the decision-making process. And like Rossi, Trow speaks of the possibility of basic social changes including the establishment of minimum income provisions, full civil and legal rights for all, compensatory socialization in family situations, and perhaps even a negative income tax.

From the vantage point of his immense authority as a pioneer in pre-school programs, Martin Deutsch cautioned that we may be expecting too much from this form of intervention. It is unlikely that such experiences will substantially reduce cumulative social and psychological deficits unless they are 1) articulated with subsequent school programs, 2) effectively interpreted to parents and the school system, and 3) taught by instructors who find gratification in teaching "slow" children. It is evident that Deutsch feels that, in the haste to introduce pre-school programs, some of these conditions have been neglected. It is essential at the very least to introduce into all such efforts systematic provisions for effective evaluation. Such evaluation as now exists tends to be inadequate. According to Deutsch: "It has been evaluation of output variables; an evaluation of performance, not evaluation of process; not evaluation of where learning takes place or how it takes place."

The entire problem of introducing a greater measure of equality and quality in the education of the disadvantaged is, of course, only one aspect of the broader question of how to provide individualized instruction for all children, no matter what their social origin. Papers by Samuel Kirk, John Flanagan, and Edgar Friedenberg dealing with various facets of "individual diversity" provoked the spirited discussion on the merits of ability grouping and the use of tests that was to occupy much of the subsequent attention of the conference.

Kirk's admirable treatment of inter-individual differences (variability among members of a group) and intra-individual differences (variability within the same person at different points of time) clearly indicates how moot are the assumptions underlying homogeneous grouping. The author cited the evidence compiled by H. G. Shane showing that there are no fewer than thirty-five plans that have been adopted by schools to group children according to one or more differentiae. Thus, for example, it is common to classify by such broad categories as "gifted" and "retarded" but there is no clearcut evidence that these practices have been beneficial. As Kirk points out, "one of the reasons why a simple administrative organization has not solved all of the problems encountered by variability in children is that gifted children or mentally retarded children do not themselves form a homogeneous group." Considerable data substantiate that retarded children exceed the average in weight, height, and motor coordination. There is considerable overlap in sensory and motor areas and even in interpersonal relations.

The rationale for ordinary "tracking" procedures within normal populations, that are based on the assumption that intelligence is a fixed quantity, are equally questionable. Kirk's summary is instructive:

> The extensive literature available today indicates, a) that the I.Q.'s of young children are not constant when we exclude the clinical and pathological cases such as mongoloids; b) that the greatest increases and decreases occur mostly between birth and three years of age; c) that increases and decreases in tested intelligence can occur between ages four and seven but in diminishing extent; and d) that enriched or

stimulating environments can increase the rate of development of children from disadvantaged homes even at a later age, and e) that the increases are in inverse relationship to the age of the child.

These findings suggest that any grouping of children based on the assumption that intelligence is an immutable entity is not consistent with the evidence. They also lead Kirk to conclude with others that, since most of the growth or decline in tested intelligence occurs before the age of three, pre-nursery schools should be established for those children whose environments are unfavorable to learning.

In his discussion of children with special disabilities or behavior disorders, Kirk emphasizes that the school need not always, a la psychiatrists and caseworkers, treat "underlying causes." Frequently disabilities may be dealt with at the symptomatic level and in individual tutorial situations. He cites as illustrations the instance of a boy whose emotional disturbances were alleviated by the removal of a reading deficiency and an account of twenty-five boys, most of whom were cured of biting their nails by the simple expedient of having a manicurist file them shorter.

The discussants of the paper, Fritz Redl and Milton Schwebel, concurred in Kirk's views that some problems are adequately disposed of by treating them purely as learning difficulties. Schwebel suggested that attention to such simple matters as teaching children how to study might alleviate many of their tensions and anxieties and that requisite individual tutoring might well be undertaken by the unorthodox method of recruiting able students to teach others.

At the same time, Redl emphasized that Kirk had perhaps unwittingly shown disrespect for clinical complexity. "Symptoms" differ in their significance. Some are of no interest to the clinician, but others are indicative of subsurface problems that must be treated with available modes of psychotherapy. In any case, it is important to recognize that children are much more varied and puzzling than clinical classifications would indicate and that they do not conveniently classify themselves in accord with textbook categories.

John Flanagan found himself discussing many of these same issues in his paper on the "external" and "internal" influences affecting the school, some of which Clarence Senior made more vivid by specific references to New York. Some of the external factors cited include the rise of science and technology, the changing character of urban communities, conflicts between various political subdivisions, the increasing salience of international relations, and a growing emphasis on quality education for the gifted. Internal problems include tradition and inertia within the educational system, poor quality of textbooks, the distribution of talent within the education professions, and the changing characteristics of the school population. The complexity that arises from the convergence of these "external" and "internal" forces lead Flanagan to conclude that schools must constantly evaluate their programs in the manner of the management procedures and technologies used by modern business organizations.

His main focus was the desirability of developing a procedure that would 1) define the school's goals in behavioral terms; 2) devise means for measuring the child's potential for achieving these goals, the amount he has already learned and the rates at which he has learned; 3) introduce methods of evaluating instructional material and practices; and 4) collect data on the subsequent experiences of students with selected characteristics who have been exposed to various curricula and teaching strategies. Since it is difficult to store so much information in the head of any one individual, these data would be committed to the memory of a computer which would feed them to school personnel as quickly as they were needed. Although these proposals offended some members of the conference as excessively mechanistic, Flanagan intended them to assist individual students to achieve their own personal goals. According to him:

> To assist the student in planning long-range educational and occupational goals, the counselor would compare the same comprehensive student data in the computer memory with norms based on studies of the experience of students with similar characteristics. For example, if the student indicated he is seriously considering engineering, the counselor can inform him that 80 per cent of the boys with this pattern of aptitudes, interests, achievement, and activities who enter college engineering courses graduate.

Herman Long, one discussant of Flanagan's paper, objected to the fact that the evaluation procedures cited were not germane to the problems of equality of educational opportunity because they failed to take into account that Negroes, low income groups, and others were afflicted by varying degrees of chronic disability. An approach that appeared to assume that the observed characteristics of children adequately represent their "true" capacities in effect countenanced the continued existence of current inequities. During the same session, Clarence Senior noted with some satisfaction that in his home city, New York, achievement tests have been substituted for I.Q. tests which assume that "measured intelligence" is free from the contamination of environmental influences.

Many conferees apparently shared the skepticism about the value of group testing. Their chief objections seemed to be that prior knowledge about students in the form of group norms might lead to undesirable instructional practices which would hinder the discovery of the child's capabilities. Samuel Shepard describes what may occur in many classrooms when teachers pattern their instruction to the I.Q. of their students:

> Mary has an I.Q. of 119. Mary doesn't respond very quickly, so what does the teacher do? Now, come on, Mary, you can do this. You know how we did it last week. Well, she starts pushing, she starts motivating, stimulating, encouraging, and she doesn't give up until she is satisfied with Mary's performance.
>
> What happens typically when she calls on old Charles over here with 71? Well, if he grunts clearly, she pats him on the shoulder: that's fine. Now, you be here tomorrow and we will move the pianos and water the flowers and you can dust the erasers and you can do all of these things. This is differentiating the instruction according to the ability of the kid. This is the kind of chance that old Charles gets. He doesn't have a sucker's chance. He has no such thing as an equal educational opportunity. What stimulation and motivation does he have? None.

The expression of strong misgivings about testing was by no means unanimous. While all agreed that standard measuring devices were subject to abuse, several conferees believed that their use was inevitable in a mass society. The remedy consists in alerting all who use tests of their danger and in converting them from instruments of invidious comparison to diagnostic devices. Mildred Goldberg added the caution that the current antipathy to the use of group I.Q. tests might be still another expression of the faddism that periodically appears in the field of education. These instruments, she thought, should not be abandoned without further study and in the absence of alternative evaluation procedures.

Edgar Friedenberg's discussion of individual differences implied that, although the conferees seemed united in their willingness to respect individual diversity in the cognitive realm, they were not similarly zealous about the right of children to reject the middle class, bureaucratic "wheeling and dealing" ethos. Thus, Friedenberg argued, while it is true that children must be taught to survive in a corrupt and conformist society, they should not be persuaded of its moral superiority. Genuine quality education would not encourage them to develop the "marketing" orientation that is so characteristic of success in school and society. The school is especially culpable when it confuses spontaneous and open life styles that in their totality represent "fidelity to self" with pathology and in the name of treatment and helping seeks to reclaim the student for the sterile world of their "better adjusted" peers and elders. This, Friedenberg holds, is simply an unwarranted intrusion on the privacy and integrity of the individual personality. In general, the author was skeptical as to whether those persons who proposed to intervene in behalf of the underprivileged would be willingly retained by those whom they would help.

Both Miriam Goldberg and Samuel Shepard who discussed Friedenberg's paper were sympathetic to his concern for the individuality of students. However, Shepard, whose Bannecker Program in St. Louis is one of the few demonstrably successful efforts to introduce greater quality and equality in education, contended that:

> Middle class values and behavior patterns characterize the mainstream of American life. The culturally-disadvantaged Negro is largely outside of that stream and, indeed, often incompatible with it, certainly in the urban centers of the nation. The very survival of the Negro and of the democratic way of life itself demands that no large segment of our population be allowed to be apart from this stream.

Professor Goldberg was not altogether persuaded by the privacy arguments advanced by Dr. Friedenberg.

> We have only a bare beginning and there is a great deal that needs to be learned about how to compensate for every deficiency; how to present learning tasks to children and, yes, how to help them want to learn. If this is an intrusion of their privacy, so be it. But without this intrusion they will not learn to read and write, to deal with ideas or develop their talents. If we guard their privacy from intrusion by the school, it will remain a privacy of discouragement and defeat, of distorted self-image and self-rejection and be left wide open to the intrusion of destructive forces which prey upon the marginal individual.

It is evident that both Goldberg and Shepard do not believe that the failure to intervene liberates the individual. We are obliged to try to change the lives of our students, but we should do so, as Dr. Goldberg puts it, by creating "learning situations in which children with great ranges of ability, children with diverse interests and bents and talents can proceed with their education."

Every such aspiration for the improvement in the quality of instruction directs our attention to the recruitment and training of schoolmen. Robert Schaefer's paper emphasizes that although extrinsic motivations such as salary, fringe benefits, and social status are important elements in attracting and retaining teachers it is probable that "the kinds of psychic rewards available in the instructional situation itself are of more fundamental importance to the teacher than the tangible apples society may choose to place on his desk." The availability of such rewards are, however, sharply restricted in "slum schools" by the inadequacy of the teacher's collegiate preparation and the frustrations of his actual teaching situation. His professional training does not equip him to develop a logic of pedagogical presentation that parallels the underlying structure of the discipline. He is thus not prepared to translate the abstractions of the conventional university course in history, mathematics, literature, or science into experiences that are meaningful to students with low academic motivations in schools located in "disadvantaged" urban neighborhoods. He may know even less about "how to deal with youngsters who have not already been convinced by their social backgrounds that the school is a necessary and reasonable institution." Moreover, the neophyte teacher seldom receives substantial help from older colleagues since they, themselves, have often grown cynical and weary from a similar inability to cope with the mysteries of children and curriculum. The net result is that the teacher in "deprived" areas derives little intellectual satisfaction from his daily burdens.

Schaefer suggests that both teachers' colleges and the schools are culpable in this situation, but that "the basic fact is our ignorance; we simply don't know how to entice the elusive intellects of lower class children let alone how to achieve the mastery of abstract knowledge and analytical skills modern society demands." What is required are school boards and superintendents who are prepared to acknowledge the inadequacy of the existing state of knowledge and who are prepared to convert slum schools into centers of inquiry which would be concerned with the production as well as the transmission of knowledge. Since, according to Schaefer, "the problems of urban education are inherently fascinating," a new breed of teacher-scholar could be attracted to low income schools because they could be offered psychic rewards in the form of intellectual satisfactions that are now denied them.

If Schaefer seeks inventive, even radical solutions, he does so with the expectation that these may be introduced under the auspices of the present educational system. Judson Shaplin believes, by contrast, that given the magnitude and complexity of the dilemmas that now beset us it is necessary to seek assistance from "outside the profession." He identifies a number of constraints that limit mass recruitment of able teachers for low income schools: a limited pool of talent, the low prestige of teacher training, the tendency of graduates of elite colleges to teach in elite schools, and the preference of teachers to remain in their own neighborhood. Under these circumstances, Shaplin argues, it is imperative to discover new institutional channels through which talented persons can enter teaching. These might include, among others, people now engaged in other professions and those who, despite a natural gift for teaching, are now deterred from entering the profession by the excessively long period of apprenticeship. It is, moreover, essential to establish links between the educational system and a para-professional structure consisting of social agencies and volunteer groups who could provide the necessary skilled manpower that will not be available if business is conducted as usual.

Theodore Sizer disagreed with the major theses of both panelists. Unlike Schaefer, he does not believe that our chief malady is ignorance but rather the failure to make effective use of existing knowledge; unlike Shaplin, he holds that the impetus for reform must necessarily come from within the educational establishment. The guardians of the gates are professors in teacher training institutions and the relatively small proportion of people who make critical decisions in the school system. If persons who occupy these strategic positions are not competent, prospective teachers will be poorly trained, good talent will be squandered, and the schools will be stagnant. The challenge is how to reconcile two seemingly antithetical concepts, "establishment" and "revolutionary"; for what is urgently required are men in power who are nevertheless eager to serve as agents of radical change.

The final session of the conference, on continuing education, was organized on the assumption that education should not be the special privilege of youth. John Powell, like Harold

Taylor, perceived a threat to democratic institutions in the presumed widening of the gap between an educated elite and an ignorant mass. He deduces, therefore, that:

> What we are faced with is a new kind of imperative: a perception of life-long education as a patriot's duty, which may reach the force of a popular will that men and women should continue to advance their education, by whatever means, or be looked upon as slackers.

Continuing education should embrace three levels of learning: skills, knowledge, and pursuit of understanding. Some of these, such as the acquisition of skills involved in manpower training appeal to economic incentives while others enrich the spirit. But the people who seek education for any of these reasons are deplorably few. The "'motivational deficit' between what is available and what is utilized" has its source in unhappy early school experiences, ethnic despair, the lower class ethos, undue contentment with one's lot, personality disorders, and rejection of American values. The means of overcoming these barriers to learning exist in the form of motivational devices including those refined by the mass media. These should be imaginatively utilized to persuade the apathetic to enrich their lives. It is also critical to define educational objectives so that they will be consistent with clearcut national purposes, including the development of a "mature" citizenry. At present, adult education suffers from an embarrassment of riches. Its offerings represent a gigantic smorgasbord which permits "an almost total freedom of often meaningless choice."

Lewis Hacker and Ernest van den Haag who discussed Powell's paper shared a number of discontents in common. Both dissent from the view that adult education should be pursued in obedience to a sort of "general will" that is primarily responsive to over-riding national purpose. Schooling beyond the twelfth year should, according to both critics, be governed by a pluralism dictated by consumer sovereignty that might quite conceivably find expression in a great range of lofty and frivolous pursuits. Moreover, Hacker and van den Haag both assert that the decision not to seek further education might represent a rational choice as balanced against other uses of time and energy. In general, each doubted that American society was in as dire need of salvation as Powell had indicated, or that adult education should serve as an instrument for its redemption.

It should be clear from the preceding sketchy synopses that during a crowded three days the conferees confronted a formidable number of important issues bearing on quality and equality in education. However, as in every such collective enterprise, there were inevitable lacunae. Since the participants in any conference approach its major theme from the perspective of their own specialized interests, it is not reasonable to expect them to consider either the generic meaning of crucial terms or the full range of the conditions that must be satisfied if aspirations are to become tangible accomplishments.

Accordingly, four additional essays were written at the end of the conference. Three of these by Urie Bronfenbrenner, Seymour Harris, and Robin Williams deal with the psychological, economic, and social costs of achieving quality education for all. Each in its own fashion delineates the price that must be paid in increased allocation of resources, altered institutional arrangements, and revised standards of welfare if we are really serious about our goals. In the concluding piece we shall exercise the editors' prerogative of speaking the final words on many of the problems that occupied the conferees and some that did not. This integrative essay consists of an educational credo that affirms our own partisan convictions about quality and equality in education.

This volume, then, includes four parts:

Part I consists of seven papers that were circulated in advance of the conference; a summary and supplementary statement by the writer of the paper; two critical evaluations; a summary statement by the chairman of the session; and an edited record of remarks by other participants.

Part II includes the three papers on the psychological, economic, and social costs of achieving quality and equality in education.

Part III contains the final essay by the editors.

Part IV is an annotated bibliography devoted to the seven major topics of the conference for the benefit of those who wish to explore these issues further.

The discussions in each of these sections raise more questions than they answer. Nevertheless, the shared sense of moral urgency that prevailed at the Princeton conference on quality and equality in education augers well for the future. Indeed, passions sometimes triumphed over the bland etiquette of conference protocol. At one point, one writer of a major paper remarked that "those of us who have sat in this particular seat have found ourselves unconsciously developing a way of glancing down to see whether wires run into the wall and where the switch is." As the reader explores the papers in this volume and eavesdrops on the discussions, we trust that he will share some of the sense of intellectual excitement that arises when good minds clash over issues which truly engage them.

SESSION ONE

Theme: POLARITIES AND TENSIONS IN THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

Introduction	JAMES E. ALLEN	i - ii
Theme Paper and Supplementary Comments	HAROLD TAYLOR	1 - 13 c
Discussion	SIDNEY HOOK	14 - 20
Discussion	MARTIN MAYER	21 - 30
Response	HAROLD TAYLOR	31 - 38
Additional Queries and Responses		39 - 53

INTRODUCTION

by

James E. Allen

Our subject tonight is "Polarities and Tensions in the Educational System." One of the tensions in my quest for quality and equality in education, and I expect this is true of most of you, is reflected in my being here. When I think of the work that is piling up on my desk during these two days, my tensions rise. I feel a polarity between my desire to be here to take time to think through with you the way to meet our current problems and my desire to get on with the job of trying to get a budget passed in the New York State Legislature, the job of initiating and supporting new projects so that next year we will be able to do better than we did this year, the job of meeting the press and the public and trying to develop a climate for better support of education, and the new job of working with dozens of Federal, State, and local agencies to make the Anti-Poverty Act a reality.

My tension is symbolic of that in education today between the desire to build a new intellectual foundation for education in a free society and the need to act now. I hope that this very distinguished company can help ease this tension. We need to know what kind of education we should be offering to meet varied individual needs, how to get individuals to accept the education that is best for them, and how to get society to provide the resources to give to each the quality of education that will help him realize all that he is capable of becoming. And certainly this is a tall order.

It is made even more difficult by the scale of the problem. To be realistic, solutions must take into account the numbers who must be educated, the shortness of time we have to educate them, and the limited number of people available to do the job. Too many programs deal with hundreds when the need is in the thousands, or would do in 50 years what must be done in five.

There is another polarity that is very much on our minds these days, between our desire to help directly those who seem most in need of help, namely, what are called today the disadvantaged, and our recognition that at least half of the problem is the attitude of those who are supposedly advantaged. Until those attitudes are changed, our efforts will generate more tensions than they resolve.

And finally, there is the tension between our notion that the way to solution lies in better education for a world of work and our recognition that the world may have little work for most people to do. Of course, I guess if most of us could share our own labors, we would solve the problem of unemployment. Do we educate for employment and hope that the jobs will be there? Or educate for leisure and hope that society will change to make a dignified life of leisure possible for all who wish it? Wherever the there of tomorrow is, how do we get from here to there?

SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS
by
Harold Taylor

What apparently bothers me is that in a big society where we are trying to develop new cultural forms and new social institutions adequate to keep up to the changes that are occurring within the society, the educators themselves are making some assumptions and are concerning themselves with the implications of those assumptions in a way which I don't think is meeting the essential issue.

The essential need in a mass culture is to find new ways of dealing with a set of new problems with which the present institutions of the society are inadequte to deal. I have been bothered by the inadequacy of the curricular reforms which have not kept up with the changes in the society and the dislocation between curricular reforms and the actual conditions of the society itself.

The problem is: How do you develop qualities within the educational institutions which can, without diluting the effort of individuals in the teaching faculty, educate each person in his own terms? I find that the frame of reference in which educational thinking is going on in contemporary America is one which shows the problem of this dislocation.

When we think of the way in which the poverty program was developed, and the kind of implications that this has for New York State, we find very good people like Pat Moynahan and Adam Yarmolinsky working very fast to write legislation to get a poverty program going. And while these are inventive people who know what are the social issues in America, and what needs to be done, we are hurrying to get legislation which can put into effect the economic and social consequences of modified programs of government aid, without a continuing body of thought and research going into what are the problems in the society which education can solve, if we would move ahead of the situations which emerge as society changes.

While the poverty program will have and must have a profound effect on the educational situation in the United States, it is essentially an improvised program, producing a new set of problems about which nobody has done a study.

I use this simply as an example of what I've pointed out in the paper as a split in the culture between the organization of a mass society and the organization of a meritocracy or an elite. The present tendency among educators is to think of the educational questions in academic terms, so that you have, on the one hand, a group of people who are very much concerned to solve the social questions in the country and, on the other hand, a group of people who are concerned to solve the educational questions, as if the two weren't so completely combined that it's impossible to talk about the one without the other.

I tried to say this bluntly in these words: "The paradox of the present situation is that while educational leadership remains tied to conventional academic concepts of content and structure, political leadership within the executive branch of government has broken new ground in education by concerning itself with the improvement of social and economic conditions. Or, to put it another way, while Mr. Conant is advocating reforms within the educational structure and the coordination of existing bureaucracies, Mr. Shriver, Mr. Wirtz, and their colleagues are inventing new programs of education designed to remedy defects produced by the present structure and its bureaucracies. In doing so, they are creating a demand for reforms in all aspects of the educational system, particularly in the field of teacher preparation, where the present emphasis on increasing academic content and professional skill has distracted attention from the need for teachers with direct experience of the society in which the child and young adult are situated."

I would add that if we are to get at the key question of quality of education in a mass culture, we have to relate what we are doing in the schools to the issues in the society. I would number among the advantages which we now have such forces as a new student movement which takes students into the slums and into the South to develop new educational programs of the students' own devising, the renewed interest on the part of the government, through the Office of Education, in serious research on those questions having to do with social, economic and educational change, increased interest on the part of the academic community at large in the problems of curriculum in the sciences, the social studies and in literature.

I would identify as another resource those who speak critically of American education, from whatever point of view, insofar as they raise issues which previously had no visibility at all. These issues have recently become more visible partly through the Negro protest movement, partly through the renewed interest on the part of the academic faculties in serious educational questions, partly through the public interest in education as evidenced by public discussions which previously did not take place.

There are all forces working toward the identification of the crucial issues that jointly face the educators and the critics of society.

DISCUSSION
by
Sidney Hook

I want to make it clear that my critical comments are in the nature of questions to Mr. Taylor, which I am sure, in the light of his vast educational experience, he will be able to answer, but which I didn't find answered in his paper. Mr. Taylor makes a number of statements -- some true, some not quite true, some extremely dubious -- about the American power structure, and the alleged military-industrial-governmental bureaucratic complex which has sacrificed the educational needs of the country to defense, the cold war, or whatnot.

Now, I can match almost every one of Mr. Taylor's statemtns with some other statemtns from the writings of Mr. Robert Hutchins, and from the writing of a few liberal supporters of the Council for Basic Education. I think Arthur Bestor would agree with some of these statements. And yet, Mr. Taylor's educational philosophy and program is almost completely different from that of Mr. Hutchins.

Mr. Hutchins, who agrees with Mr. Taylor's indictment of American culture, offers an educational program which I believe Mr. Taylor finds totally unacceptable. This makes me wonder about the relevance of Mr. Taylor's social propadeutic to a possible and desirable reconstruction of the American educational system. I am not denying that there may be a connection. But it has not been spelled out.

Assume that we have all the money in the world (or enough) to reconstruct our school system; that it is properly integrated racially and religiously; that it is free in the very sense that Mr. Taylor describes, "to create and support a full-bodied system of public education throughout the entire country." The questions which concern us most as educators are: What should the curriculum be? How should it be taught? How should it be organized? What would an education of quality be? Would it be the same for all on every level? What reply can be made to the widespread feeling that with mass education we are drowning in a sea of mediocrity.

Mr. Taylor does not distinguish carefully enough between two things: (1) the absence of the opportunity for all American children to make good educationally, and (2) the conception of what it means to have a good education.

Mr. Taylor does make it unmistakeably clear that whatever a good education is, American children in the main do not now have it. But I am sorely puzzled to discover what specific things he would like to substitute for the diverse curriculums of study we now have, the ways of studying them, and the organization of the schools.

He says that the new democratic conception of education "must accommodate all the people and all their children" in the public schools, although I am not sure whether, in addition to elementary school and high school, this means some kind of college as well. But at the same time he criticizes the public schools because they consider themselves primarily as institutions of academic preparation. Indeed, the public schools are taken to task for assuming that their students "will eventually take their place in the production, distribution and use of organized knowledge" -- which pretty much covers most things a person can do. There is hardly any activity which a person can engage in which does not entail "the use of organized knowledge."

Mr. Taylor carries his criticisms of the public schools to a point which queries the wisdom of what some regard as the most promising aspect of the current American school system, namely, the new programs in mathematics and physics and social studies with which many schools are experimenting. Now, this concern with knowledge is responsible, according to Mr. Taylor, for "shifting the attention of the schools to reform of the academic curriculum and away from the consideration of the entire cultural context in which educational reforms are necessary."

This quotation is important because it gives us a clue to what Mr. Taylor would like the school curriculum to stress. Instead, or perhaps in addition to, the reform of the academic curriculum, he urges "consideration of the entire cultural context in which educational reforms are necessary." This may mean any one of a number of things. It may mean that schools should study as part of their curriculum the nature of current society, its problems and its tensions. And if this is what it means, I believe that it is already part of the curriculum of studies and that where it is not, it can become part of the curriculum if educators show sufficient vigor. In any event, the study of the "entire cultural context", or even part of it, must be controlled by "organized knowledge", which Mr. Taylor thinks we stress too much.

But the quotation may mean more than this. It may mean -- and there is some evidence that this is really his meaning -- that not only should the schools consider or study the moral and social issues of the time on the appropriate curricular levels, but that the schools must in some way contribute to their solution, by taking sides, so to speak, and in this way help transform society.

And he refers nostalgically to the 1930's when, he says, the country turned to its educators and to education for some solution to the crucial issues of social and economic reorganization. Of course, the country did no such thing in the 1930's. Institutionally, the trade unions and the government played a much greater role than the schools did in the New Deal. The whole problem of the relation between school and society in a democracy is very complex, but I think that two easy positions are demonstrably false. The first is Utopianism, which believes that the schools can, by their own efforts, rebuild or reconstruct a society; and the converse is defeatism, which denies that the schools can have any, even an indirect effect, on social changes.

Actually, where the school declares itself to be an agency of social changes it is more likely to throw its support to the status quo than to revolutionize it, for obvious reasons -- the power structure is one of them.

The most desirable effects of the school in the way of social change are produced, it seems to me, by indirection through the development of imaginative, critical, well-informed young men and women.

I hope I have not done Mr. Taylor an injustice, but when in lieu of "the improvement of the content and method of academic instruction," he urges "the improvement of the total environment of values and ideas in which the young are growing up," he seems to me to be Utopian in the bad sense; that is, to be burdening the school with a task which is not its specific function to achieve. It is to expect the school to do the work of the home, the church, the state, and industry.

In another connection, Mr. Taylor deplores the fact that "educators have allowed themselves to be swept along in the flood of demands created by the growth of society." Well, I think that's true, but good causes, too, can make illegitimate demands on the school. We must distinguish between demands and demands, with the educational growth of the child as the primary criterion of selection.

There is a kind of crisis psychology which has been developing with reference to the school in this country. It has been growing in strength since the Second World War, and especially since Sputnik. It assumes that the curriculum of our colleges can and should be oriented towards meeting the specific crises which periodically threaten to set the world aflame or undermine our national survival. And it reflects itself in proposed changes in the curriculum of the high schools and elementary schools, too. It assumes that the course of study can be periodically redrawn to enable us to win a war or preserve the peace or save some threatened civil rights, prevent over-population or accumulation of wheat, or whatever good cause we deem as citizens -- and rightfully deem -- to have overwhelming priority at the moment.

Now it's one thing to aim to develop through curricular means the attitudes and capacities necessary to think through and to act in periods of crisis; it's quite another thing to believe that the special knowledge and skills required for the mastery of the specific crises can be acquired in advance of its appearance. It is one thing to develop readiness of response, a capacity to find and utilize resources in an emergency; it's quite another to train for the achievement of a specific posture, however excellent, in relation to a specific issue.

With respect to promoting generous social and political attitudes, the school may achieve more in the long run by developing the students' personalities to think, to imagine, to dream, to respond sensitively to other human beings than by explicit indoctrination in behalf of good causes.

One of the ends of formal education is the development within the student of the powers of self-education when his formal schooling ceases and in full consciousness of his personal identity, he exercises his functions as a free citizen, and gratifies whatever love of learning he has acquired in consequence of his educational experience.

What I sense in Mr. Taylor's position is a wish to dissolve the walls between school and society too soon, and to give educational weight of a disproportionate kind to the experience of the child outside the school rather than inside, and this seems to me to be premature at the stage when formal schooling is still in order.

I am all for enriching the educational experience of the child by relating what he does inside the school to what he does outside, but there must be educational guidance -- it must be structured -- and there must be controls in this process and a special role for the teacher. Society becomes a school for the individual only when he is mature, only when he is embarked upon the unending course of self-education.

In this connection two things strike me as peculiar in Mr. Taylor's account of the school. The first is his praise of the American public school of the past and its liveliness when it served "as the great leveler and the great uplifter, the place where the variety of foreign cultures met, and where children were taught to be citizens."

Well now, I attended such a school in a Williamsburg Brooklyn slum fifty years ago, and perhaps the most universal wish among the students, bright and dull, was expressed in a daily prayer that it burn down.

These were schools of conformity and boredom and cruelty on the part of the teachers to students and of students to each other. And those who continued their education, a small minority, did so despite the schooling of the melting pot, impelled by their own intellectual drives. That Mr. Taylor should make invidious comparisons between these schools of the past, in reaction to which the progressive education movement really developed, and the modern school, which is vastly more aware of the student's needs and much better equipped to cope with a diversity that in the old schools was regarded just as a short step from delinquency, is a mystery to me.

Nor can I understand why he keeps on referring to the curriculums of the modern schools as "middle-class, white Protestant". What's "middle-class" about geometry or French or physics? The epithet is irrelevant to most of the curriculum. And to the extent that it refers to the values of the curriculum, there are good middle-class values and there are bad. And the worst middle-class values of all -- like commercial success -- were actually stressed by the old schools in melting-pot times. They were not stressed nearly as much in the schools in which I taught and still less in those that my children attended. And I think I'm one of the few people in a graduate faculty of arts and sciences who has taught on every level of the educational system of this country except the kindergarten.

And as for Protestant values, the erosion of religion from the curriculum of the public schools to a point where today even an innocuous prayer To Whom It May Concern is taboo, shows how far we have come. I didn't want to make these criticisms, but they made me make them.

I should like now to leave Mr. Taylor's paper and state some of my own views in telegraphic form on the question of quality and equality in education. I tried to work out the details of this in the second edition of my EDUCATION FOR MODERN MAN, but I don't think many more of you read that book than read the papers of this conference.

Democracy in education entails not a belief in the equality of human talent but rather commitment to an equality of concern for every child in the community to develop himself as a person with matured powers. There is a fundamental confusion in the attempt to base the policy of democracy in education on alleged facts of intellectual equality or to contest it on the ground of intellectual inequality. The normal variation of capacities in children is morally irrelevant to whether they should all enjoy the equality of our communal concern. But such equality of concern does not require equal educational treatment. Unequal educational treatment, like unequal medication treatment, is sometimes justified when required by the necessities of intellectual and emotional growth in each case.

Recognition of intellectual differences is not anti-democratic unless intelligence becomes the principle of differentiation in a graded, hierarchically organized society. No matter what the principle of social differentiation is, if it involves hierarchy, official or unofficial, it involves the opportunity and the likelihood of exploitation.

For reasons which cannot be expatiated on now, we face a developing situation in which it can be safely anticipated that attendance at college -- I hesitate to college education -- will be, if not universal, as widespread as secondary education today. And the nub of the problem is this: if we pursue the goal of excellence in education can we fashion a meaningful educational curriculum whose legitimate demands will not be beyond the reach of a sizable portion of our youth? The facts of biology cannot be blinked; they do not depend upon our political prepossessions, and they may defeat our aspirations if too unrealistic. Even today some of my colleagues report that the entire level of academic achievement in all but a few select colleges is sinking. Good fellowships are going begging, because people are not qualified to take them. Graduate Students of marginal capacity are being offered professorial posts in places which in the past would never have considered them.

Now, I believe a great deal can be done by special programs of coaching and other measures to reduce the disparities in educational readiness, but the differences in capacity will remain. And if we seriously expect to enroll most of our youth in colleges, including the group -- call them the less-bright group -- which no culture in the world has ever taken beyond bare literacy, we must plan our curriculums in such a way that they do not imperil the education of those who are not less bright, but bright and very bright.

As democrats we believe that every child, not only the one starred for excellence, but the one that's not so excellent, has the right to be educated to the full reach of his capacities. If students can significantly profit by some instruction, we have no justification to deprive them of the opportunity of continued schooling. But these two propositions do not entail the view that all students must study the same things in the same way and to the same depth.

The paradox is that as existing colleges are striving to raise their standards of performance and achievement -- and most good liberal arts colleges now consider themselves as preparatory schools for graduate school, as this is taking place, raising their standards both for admission and graduation, the number of those pressing for entry into colleges increases.

There is no one panacea that I can find to meet the situation. We can open the doors of the college to anyone with a high school diploma, and give a high school diploma to any child with staying power, but we must organize more than one type of curriculum, diversify the degrees granted, introduce programs leading to special certificates of distinctive merit that will enable students to begin their vocational experience at an earlier age than their differently endowed and more gifted brothers and sisters who must prepare themselves sooner or later for a living, too. There is still a great deal of snobbism about vocational as distinct from professional education in liberal arts colleges. But until the necessity for earning a living disappears, there can be no reasonable objection, so long as the basic objectives of general or liberal education are not jeopardized, to using the schools to prepare onself for a good living as well as for a good life.

But the future situation promises to be more difficult for reasons which Commissioner Allen indicated in his opening remarks. Our technological revolution, the consequence of what Whitehead calls the most revolutionary discovery in all history, namely, the method of the method of invention, may, in the future, erode the necessity of earning a living by making the brains of mediocre human beings vocationally obsolescent. The age of automation and applied nuclear energy, according to my good friend, Abba Lerner, may produce a world in which work becomes a privilege rather than a necessity. The Utopia described by Oscar Wilde is not yet on us, but it is in view, and that is a Utopia based on slavery, the slavery of the machine to man.

Now, the coming obsolescence of all but managerial and inventive functions by a route that neither Marx nor Veblen nor Dewey anticipated actually restores to a central place in schooling, it seems to me, the ideal of Greek liberal education. These ideals presupposed that free men are concerned with the pursuit and enjoyment of ends, of consummatory experiences, and not with the means and instrumentalities which were relegated to the provenances of slaves. These ideals supposed that the vocation of a free man is active citizenship, not earning a living.

In the economy of the future, if present trends continue, even John Dewey's noble ideal to eliminate the dualism which existed in industrial society between "earning one's living" and "living one's life" becomes irrelevant in fashioning an educational curriculum. For all of Dewey's faith in the revolutionary consequences of science, the realities far outstripped his expectations. And that is why, it seems to me the only section of Dewey's immortal work, which is still very relevant to our concern, DEMOCRACY AND EDUCATION, the only section which is obsolescent today is Dewey's discussion of the key place of vocation in education. And at the time that he wrote this, in 1916 when his book was published, his assumption that the education of the high school would necessarily require organization around vocation. And if we read that today, we see that it isn't relevant.

In a world which is genuinely a welfare economy, in which poverty is marginal or has been wiped out, how can education help human beings to develop a center around which to organize their experiences so that they can live a rich and meaningful life? This is the ultimate issue and challenge to those of us who believe that the existence of leisure, which grows with the decline of the length of the working day, makes all the more necessary emphasis upon significant educational experience.

Now, the challenge to this view was expressed by T. S. Eliot in his well-known essay on MODERN EDUCATION AND THE CLASSICS in 1932, in which he criticized the development of mass education for an elite. I quote from that. "The uneducated man with an empty mind", he ways, "if he be free from financial anxiety or narrow limitation, and can obtain access to golf clubs, dance halls, gaming tables and race tracks is, for all I can see, as well equipped to fill his leisure contentedly as is the educated man." For T. S. Eliot, the problem of education in leisure was no problem at all.

If T. S. Eliot is right, we need not concern ourselves with education of the mass society of the future, but leave it only to those few who have a special calling. But I do not believe that Eliot is right, and this for many reasons. There is time to state only one.

In modern society, intelligent citizenship, without which democracy is a myth, cannot be exercised where leisure is filled with the types of pastimes he describes, which are mainly ways of killing time. Intelligent citizenship in a democracy rests ultimately upon the spread of education, because it can serve as a powerful support of political freedom -- and this was Jefferson's insight.

The issue between T. S. Eliot and those who disagree with him is fundamentally over the desirability and viability of the democratic way of life. If men are in some way to govern themselves as well as others, whether they do it ill or well depends, among other things, on what they come to know through education about the world, society and themselves.

DISCUSSION
by
Martin Mayer

As far as Dr. Taylor's paper is concerned, I think I have some of the same objections that Professor Hook has. The bottom dropped for me, however, with the sentence about there being no line between playing music and appreciating music. As a part-time music critic, this bothers me terribly. What you are saying is that you regard both of them as good. You draw a circle around them and they are both good.

But if you had written playing and listening, and you said there was no way of drawing a line between playing and listening, you wouldn't be able to take yourself seriously, because anybody can see that there is a line between playing and listening,and appreciation is simply a literary form of listening.

And I think that this sort of problem, which is what Professor Hook was complaining about, too, this business of lumping together things that we think good as being in the same category for that reason, is what has bothered me.

I feel very badly about saying some of this, because Dr. Taylor has been kind to me on various occasions and I like to think that we fight basically on the same side. Specifically, we have been joined in opposition to Dr. Conant's Booker T. Washington approach to Negro education. We joined in opposition to the rage for standardized tests. We both worry about meritocracy. We both find it much harder than Professor Hook seems to find it to define or to delimit this word "intelligence." We both feel that the very bright can probably take care of themselves and that they are not, probably, the concern of the school system which is, by and large, not going to be staffed with very bright people.

Neither of us has Professor Hook's great interest in the size or the nature of the certificate which the bureaucracy awards the child for his persistence in taking all the damn tests that he is being given. And perhaps most important of all, we both feel that we are in a taste business and not in a science business. Both Dr. Taylor and I worry about this baselessness attitude which one does find in people.

But, really, I think that the worry about baselessness is a worry for Professor Hook and for Dr. Taylor and for myself, and not for the school teacher who, after all, sees the faces and is not nearly so far away from all of these things as those of us sitting in this room.

With all of these agreements -- and I think we have many -- I don't believe that what's in the paper is very useful. I think it starts with myths and with very big words. If we start from here, we risk chewing on cotton candy all the way, arguing meanwhile about our definitions. I feel what I consider the same myths in some of the other papers, too, and I'd like to pin some of them.

First, I'd like to jump a little on the place where Professor Hook says that Dr. Hutchins and he and Dr. Taylor and Professor Bestor are in agreement, this business of mass culture, a phrase which I must say I find beyond sensible definition, and I have been through this and out the other side on a number of occasions -- the idea that this somehow is the product of the devil, mass media in the advertising agencies, and that it does not tell us something, some of which is pretty frightening and some of which is pretty good, about the democracy itself.

In the other papers this attitude toward "mass culture" appears as a feeling that we are all being smothered in the goo from the pot boiling. I think this is demonstrable nonsense.

I think that the range of artistic and intellectual activities available to the average American is greater than it has ever been here or elsewhere at any time. The mass media in the advertising agencies are not devils; they are feed-back operations and they reflect with pretty good accuracy what majority taste amounts to, and majority in fact is not so bad as majority taste used to be. And nobody in this country is condemned to live with this garbage alone.

Incidentally, I feel no compulsion to criticize those who watch commercial rather than educational television. Among other reasons, I think they are probably getting the best of a bad bargain. I find you don't have to watch it at all. And I find it interesting, also, that most adolescents don't watch it.

Related to this false values business is the notion that the people of the country are starving educationally. This is one of the great fallacies and a very bad one, because it tends to misdirect attention. In fact, we have increased our expenditures on education from 4 percent to 6 percent of the gross national product in the years since the time right after the war -- 7 percent of the net personal income. We are now spending $20 billion a year more than we spent shortly after the war. It is one of the great accomplishments of this society and no service that I can see has been done to anyone by proclaiming the people of this country don't care about education. They may not care much about learning, but, by golly, they care about education.

Now, the money is most unequally spread. There are large stretches of this country where we face disasters unless considerably more is spent on the schools. Unfortunately, Dr. Taylor singles out New York City, which is not one of them. New York spends 10 percent of its net personal income on education right now; 6 percent on the public elementary and secondary schools alone, with 30 percent of the pupil population in private and parochial schools, and with a very extensive system of public and private universities on top of it. During the last four years expenditures on the New York City public schools have risen about $300 million. And the per pupil expenditure in the Harlem schools is now about as high as that in most of the New York suburbs, and higher than that in any suburbs I know outside the New York Metropolitan area.

The New York example is important for two reasons: first, as a demonstration that money alone doesn't get you very far; and secondly, as an example of the great danger of allowing school people to plead poverty as an excuse for not getting their work done. Until somebody puts his foot down and tells the New York schools that they could do a lot better job with what they now have -- the State tried it a few years ago, but unfortunately got dissuaded from saying it in public at the last minute, as Dr. Allen can testify -- I don't think anything of any great importance can be done in New York.

It is a matter, I think, of the most vital significance not to identify our problems with money, because you will get more money. You are not going to get an enormous amount more in a place like New York, because as the particle approaches the speed of light, it gets to be heavier. And there is an awful lot coming into New York now, but you are going to get a lot more elsewhere.

The important thing is not to let it go down the drain the way it goes down the drain in New York, and not to take New York as an example of an impoverished school system, when it has 30 percent more money per pupil than Chicago has, and it's very hard to see the difference when you visit the two systems. Apart from the three or four pupil difference in class size, what differences there are in view, I am afraid I would have to lean toward Chicago.

Now, this also comes down on mobilization for youth, which is a great accomplishment, and they got $13 million. I dislike the people who have been attacking mobilization just as much as Dr. Taylor does. I think they are a bad lot. But that doesn't mean that we have to admire mobilization. What they have been given amounted to several hundred dollars a family in the district they were working in. I don't think anybody can go down there and look at it and not have the feeling that we'd be a lot better off if that money had just been give to these poor people and not thrown down on social workers.

I felt very strongly with Professor Hook about the myth of the good old days, but I think there is a further relevance to this. I think the poverty program was predictable a few years ago -- I said so on a few occasions -- on the basis that the generation that was young and peppy in the twenties was about to pass out of controlling position and the one which looked back to youth in the thirties was about to take over. Now, I was a child in the thirties. So far as I can find out, they were horrible. I am not particularly edified by the spectacle of an intellectual elite looking back happily in the name of democracy to a time when they were cheerful because they felt they were leading a great movement and the mass of the population were wretched.

I also feel, frankly, that what has been accomplished in getting some money through the Poverty Program has not by any means been matched by the quality of thought that has gone into the ways in which the money is to be spent. Right now most of the time seems to be going into drawing up rules and regulations for the program, to guarantee that not a hell of a lot can be done with the money. And I am not dazzled, on the basis of what I have seen, with what Mr. Shriver or Mr. Wirtz or Mr. Moynahan or Mr. Yarmolinski seem to be coming up with educationally. Perhaps Dr. Ianni has seen better things recently, but up to the last time I took a look at this, they seemed pretty bewildered.

Now, it's a bewildering problem, but I don't think that we have to admire them just because they can get money. Somebody's going to have to think of some things to do.

Dr. Taylor also backs behind the thirties to idealize an alleged "traditional American aim to give every child an education suited to his talents." As I read the books, I see no reason to believe that the U.S. educational system ever came any closer to this aim than it does today, which is pretty far away.

There is also the commencement address business. Middletown poor did not, as I recall my reading, benefit all that much from going to the same schools with the rich, and the schools which dealt with the immigrants were unspeakable as Professor Hook has just mentioned, and by all the evidence that comes to us.

The Dewey section bothers me a little, too, not only because people who disagree as strongly as Professor Taylor and Professor Hook can both claim descent from Dewey, though this is itself a very severe criticism of Dewey's work.

I think the attacks that have been made on Dewey are scandalous, but I think we also have to face rather sadly the fact that with the passage of time, Dewey seems less significant when set against a James or a Pierce or a Whitehead or even a Russell. Anyway, Dewey was never a ponderable influence that I have been able to find on U.S. education. The influences were Thorndyke and Kirkpatrick -- the first saying it was science, and the second saying it was easy.

Another problem with the paper and with discussions I hear from people with whose goals I normally agree is the business of the malificent military. Now, none of us like militarism, we're all Americans, but I don't see how anybody can make any sense of the current American scene without noting the enormous importance of the desegregation of the Armed Forces. Moreover, the greatest educational effort in our history was accomplished by the military during the years of World War II and it was an effort that's spilled over into the colleges, with help from the G.I. Bill in the years thereafter.

Incidentally, Dr. Taylor's idea that the colleges were of much use in this effort seems to me a misreading of history. I was there at the time. The Army Specialized Training Program, which was all around me, was the most obvious infantry reserve I had ever seen, and, in fact, the moment the Army needed them in Africa or Europe, the Army pulled them right out of college and sent them in to be shot. But on an educational level, the military technical program was head and shoulders above anything we have ever done in vocational education.

The great tragedy of the post-war period, I think, for the Negro and for the poor at large has been the closing of the gates of the Army to those who scored below a certain mark on a standardized test. I think we ought to see how we can use this existing institution, rather than simply strike out at it as something we don't like.

I am no happier than Dr. Taylor or Professor Hook is with what they and President Eisenhower called the military-industrial complex. I think we'd better recognize that not much of that $50 billion budget could be made available to schools.

The defense establishment, directly and indirectly, takes six million people off the job market -- maybe it's a little more; Professor Harris would know. And most of what would be released if we cut down this particular budget would have to go to employing the people, and most of them would not be employed in educational capacities. Hopefully, there would be sufficient increase over a period of time in gross national product to give us something we can tax. But we aren't talking about the possibility of simply shifting $50 billion from defense into education. The world doesn't work that way.

There is the problem of cultural democracy which bothers me a great deal in much of this, and I think there is no phrase so awful, as hard-nosed, so I'll use it. We have to be hard-nosed about this sort of thing. Dr. Taylor talks of the culturally deprived in the suburbs who are deprived because they never meet kids from the Negro slums. I think this is pernicious nonsense. The important thing is that they can if they want to and, indeed, as he's been saying, there are kids in the colleges and in the high schools and in this liberal community who are doing so. The difference in the freedom of motion of these kids in the suburban high schools and in the colleges and the freedom of motion of the kids in the Negro slums and in Mississippi is so striking and so enormous.

What you talk about when you talk about deprivation is basically a loss of freedom of motion. But I do not think that anything that seems to equate these makes any sense at all, even though it's nice to think so and it's very nice to say so.

And more general, for God's sake, let us admit openly that certain cultural patterns are functional and certain cultural patterns are disfunctional in a modern industrial society. Any attempt to do something about the schools that tries to cherish all cultures equally will not convince anybody and will not get anywhere. It isn't the business that we are in.

Now, with all of the horror of the schools that Professor Hook talks about, that was their great strength -- their massive ethnocentricity. The aim was to pull arrivals into the mainstream of an existing society. Once there, as it turned out, they could and they did change it; but they got there. The Negroes have the right to get there, too. People who insist on reject rejecting the society on behalf of the Negro are not, in my observation, speaking for any sizable community. Negroes are entitled to get into this society and then reject it for themselves. And if they do get in, they will probably make changes. I hope they will and I think they will. But it's theirs to do and not the social critic spokesman.

Right at the moment, in my observation of the few I know, they don't want a brand new society. They want theirs. They are entitled to theirs. Sentimentality over what they will lose does them and the Puerto Ricans and Indians no good at all. A little honest work on which community habits must be disturbed and which may survive if the children become more competent than their parents would, I think, be valuable, but I don't see much of that being done. It would be a hard job.

Ultimately, in any event, and this is my fiercest disagreement with Dr. Taylor and my closest agreement with Professor Hook, understanding is no substitute for competence. Let the schools do better than they do now with the academic end and the social end is going to be a lot less hard to wrestle with.

There is also this business of the idealist community of the young people in the universities. Well, I like them, too, and I admire them. I admire the boys who went down to Mississippi. But I want to put in a little caveat. I know no group that is more certain to trample on my rights and liberties than the group which is devoted to the public good. Let us be very carefully, generally, about the extent to which we make everyone a sitter.

Dr. Taylor is usually on my side here. We both believe in diversity, but the experience of the thirties, I think, betrays it.

A Jesuit in the teaching business told me recently that he was unhappy at the notion that there were only two possible attitudes for the modern world, one of intense selfishness and the other a flaming martyrdom. We must develop something else, really. Frankly, as a practical matter, I don't know which hurts us more in New York right now -- the organization that is all for busing white kids up to Harlem or parents and taxpayers, the bunch which is a hundred percent against doing anything for the desegregation of the schools. Both have been enormously harmful. I would not be surprised if, really, "equal" has been more harmful over the course of the last year.

Moreover, if Dr. Taylor looks carefully at these new curricula which his friends have been making and teaching in the slums and in Mississippi, I think he will be horrified at the distortions and the dishonesties that they contain. The fact that people are doing something that we regard as good, we are on their side, does not deny the need for intellectual honesty in the approach to the problem. Yet I honor Dr. Taylor for the two traps he avoids, and they are hard traps to avoid. First, the idea that the school cannot move by itself, and secondly, the bogus scientisms of education. I think both of these must be firmly rejected, as Dr. Taylor seems to reject them.

That the school is a kind of inertia machine is quite obvious. But there are more powerful machines around, and it can be moved. Much, too much, of the current discussion seems to assume an unchanging school, and to concentrate either on pre-school work, which will be out of these guys' hands, or on manpower retraining, which we can also do away from that.

I am all for pre-kindergarten. I must say I profoundly distrust the Bloom and even the Deutschh and Bruner research which so drastically contradicts so much recorded human experience and which so neatly fall into the folds of newest fashion in behavioral science. Somebody quoted Wilder Penfield in one of these papers. I believe it might be worth remembering that Penfield also argued a few years ago toward the physiological necessity of teaching foreign languages before the age of ten. It just has to be nonsense, unless the Scandinavians are physiologically different from the rest of mankind.

In our excitement over the pre-kindergartens, which are important, particularly if they are handled well -- and I have every reason to believe that some of them are being handled well -- we run the risk of forgetting that the existing school program, matched with the existing home ambients, will wreck the graduates of the best such programs very very quickly.

This is not a puzzle where the intrusion of one new piece will make it come out right. There is no magic catalyst, if I may use the word in the presence of Dr. Friedenberg, who knows I know no chemistry. We need new leadership. We need new organizations. We probably need new school hours. We need new ways of running schools. We need new programs desperately.

One of the things that Dr. Taylor points out and that he quoted earlier, though oddly enough he quoted from his version before he put his pencil on it and therefore changed its meaning, it's right in the version you have, is the need for teachers who live in the neighborhood; not for children who have direct experience of the society, but teachers who have direct experience of the society. It's going to be hard. I am not talking about teachers who come out of similar neighborhoods, themselves. In my experience, no teacher is so rough on or so condemnatory of slum kids or so unwilling to experiment with something new as the teacher who pulled herself out of a similar hole. But we need people who are willing to have much more intimate contact with the lives of these kids than they have now.

I am not at all sure, incidentally, that we need massive sociological special preparation for the teachers who are going into these schools. Every time I see a slum teacher who seems to be getting a high order of response from kids, and I go and talk to her afterwards, I get a complaint that these kids are just like other kids, and there's an awful lot of fuss being made about nothing.

Now, what we are saying here really is that these teachers are doing something that works. Whatever sociological preparation you give the teacher coming into the slum school, if the program she is teaching and the way she is teaching it to these kids produces failure in the kids and therefore failure in herself, you are not going to get anywhere. All of your sociological training goes down the drain.

If you can give her a few things that will work, then you will change her attitude enormously and you will eliminate a very high fraction of all of the other things, and the culture shock and all of the stuff that we know about. The basic shock is that the teacher goes into the school and she fails. And after a while she hates it.

Most of all we need an attitude, we need a willingness of the school to blame itself for the failure of the children, not to blame the society for the lack of money or the parents or the children, without the belief that somewhere somehow the job can be done, without the knowledge that it is being done, without some models of the job being done, without at least an occasional experience of success for the person who is face-to-face with the problem.

And, incidentally, I don't think this is that hard, because what we have been taught to call the Hawthorne effect,would occur if we just kept trying new thi things on the grounds that the old things weren't working. All the other projects without this aren't going to help us much.

I do not share the usual American notion that the existence of what we like to call a problem proves the existence of a solution. But certainly the slum kids do not have to emerge from schools so useless as they do today. First things first. We are not trying to make an ideal world. We are not trying to change the world. We are not trying to build the new Jerasalem in this land of used car slag heaps. But we are trying to get some better fraction of children into shape to handle their future and not to be frightened of the world around them. And in all of this, if I may close with a shock, we must be as careful as we can not to specify our objectives in terms which kid us into the idea that we can accurately measure our success.

Dr. Shepard can, I suspect, speak of this more eloquently than I can. The standardized test is not a real god; it is a Ju-Ju. The big battalions are elsewhere. This is a subtle thing. Obviously, one must know something of what one is trying to do. Tests can be enormously valuable in telling you what you are doing -- more valuable for that, I think, than in telling you what the children are doing, but obviously they have values that can be used. But you mustn't insist on making what you can do something you can measure, and on determining what it is that you are going to do for these kids on the basis of whether we can measure it or not. And this is what specifying objectives normally means in the terms in which this dreadful phrase is used.

We are engaged in a wide enterprise. We gain certainty only by sacrificing breadth and variety, and by sacrificing validity. If we are to promote that tolerance of ambiguity, which is the great essential of learning and of teaching, we must be mature enough to tolerate great swatches of ambiguity in our own efforts.

I throw in the air, not for discussion, the idea that unless we are very careful, our immature behavioral scientists, with their belief in universal and necessary truths, long since discarded by the physical scientists, may handicap us more than they help us in the years to come.

RESPONSE
by
Harold Taylor

I guess the flood of ideas which has been unleashed is pretty difficult to collect together, as far as a coherent reply or comment. If only one of these people had been speaking, it might have been possible. With both men releasing that flood of ideas, I'll content myself with taking them one at a time and saying the following.

I regret that Sidney Hook was forced to comment on my paper. And I am pleased to see that as soon as he got that over with, he got to his own paper in short space.

I think on my part it would have been unfair for me to have answered all the questions in the beginning to which this conference will devote itself. I felt a little modest about answering them all at the outset.

The function of my paper was to describe the polarities and tensions in the educational system. In doing so, I tried to locate the total context in which this discussion will occur, as we move to the specifics about what do you do about a given school, what do you do about a given curriculum. And I would say that in terms of your own positive statements, which I have had the good fortune to read in your book and your books and to discuss with you, I can agree with almost everything you said when you took off, in your own fashion, to describe your own beliefs and your own suggestions for the reform of education.

My concern for relating directly, within the curriculum and within the schools themselves, with the issues in society comes from a feeling based on a particular observation of kindergarten teaching, of elementary school teaching, of high school teaching, and the opportunity to be in teachers' colleges and see what is going on there. I find in these observations that the concern of the teachers and the general run of people who are talking about education and doing something about it is to deal with questions for elementary school children and for high school students in terms of implicit themes of the society. These themes are the product of a total culture context which makes the academic success of pupils in the school system the most important criterion by which we judge their ability.

Now let me be quite specific.

The City of Chicago has had the problem of Negro segregation ever since there was a Chicago. The last two or three years have been a time in which the City of Chicago is seething with concern on the part of the Negro, and on the part of a small group of educators, that the system itself is not functioning in any way which could meet the needs of the total population of the City of Chicago. The serious controversies which have involved the Superintendent of Schools, the teachers, the Board of Education, the entire structure through which education is dealt with in Chicago, has lagged greatly behind the real needs of the children in the City of Chicago. This is why it seemed to come as a surprise to the people in Chicago that the school system wasn't working properly.

This is specifically what I meant by saying that the problems as seen by the educators have been divorced from the problems of society. Why should the people in Chicago who run the educational system be so surprised that these issues are there? When you talk to the Negroes in Chicago, you find that it's only recently that they themselves have become concerned about their own issues; that mothers and fathers, but mainly the mothers, find that their children are not able to read at any kind of level appropriate to the stage they have reached in the school system. Then the educators deny that the statistics are valid. And the system of education is only moved toward facing its own issues by protest movements, boycotts, all sorts of overt manifestations of the laggardly way in which the educators themselves have dealt with these issues. That's what I mean about the discordance between the educational thinking and the changes in the society.

Mr. Mayer's absolutely right in saying that spending more money is not the answer to the problem of improving the quality of education. The spending of money is, of course, a necessary condition under which this quality can be achieved. But what I've argued is that the sort of program represented by the Poverty Program, which wishes to use Federal funds in order to deal with specific issues in the big cities and in the rural slums, were fast products created without thought for the continuity of their development by serious educational thinkers of the sort represented here in our conference.

I think one of the great virtues of this conference is that the issues are being confronted by informed persons whose research bears directly on the crucial questions.

Let me now comment on Mr. Hook's remark about the weakness of my paper in dealing with those changes necessary in the school environment in order to produce new reforms which are institutional in character and which must stem from the work of educators in dealing with every child in whatever the situation. What I meant by the improvement of the total environment is not to recapture a world which never existed in the school, but to do something which I have seen happen in school systems and in schools where persons in the 1930's and the '40's and the '50's addressed themselves to the reality of the situation of the children in the community. I mean that it is possible and desirable and necessary, to create within the school community that kind of model for a bigger society in which values of a personal sort including appreciation of the role of playing music and its effect on oneself esthetically, the necessity of involving oneself in the administration of the school as a student, the relationship between the teacher and the faculty, the consciousness on the part of the student that there are social issues going beyond himself to which he must pay attention. These are all factors which I consider necessary, and which I would be quite prepared in another session to spell out in some detail, in order to make the school in its community an instrument of social change rather than an acceptance of the social and personal values of the community surrounding the teachers, their parents and the children themselves. I took this to be an obvious point on which there would be general agreement. I was not trying to dodge the issues, rather, I was trying to describe this as an area where out attention has not been directed, and this runs right through the suburban high school, the suburban elementary school into the schools where there is less money spent, less attention of a personal kind paid to the student.

In my reference to the suburban school and the culturally deprived, segregated from the opportunity to experience directly the attitudes and values of a different culture, I was talking not simply about the opportunity for Scarsdale students to come into New York, or Harlem children to do out into the country. I don't conceive this as simply a transportation problem. I am talking about the reality of the suburban high school in American communities, where I have found students either bored with the curriculum because it is contained within itself, or oppressed by the necessity of making good in academic terms in order to enter college.

I do believe that it is most important to dissolve the walls between the school and the society. At the same time, I see no contradiction between relating, on the one hand, what happens in the schools to the issues in the society outside, and, on the other, the development of sheer intellectual competence, and personal appreciation of esthetic values, through which, in the long run, the society will be changed and the culture made a happier place for leisure as well as for work.

I apologize for having used the figure $30 billion for the space shot. It should have been five billion a year. The total allocation is in the amount of about $30 billion for the shot which will put a man on the moon before the Russians do.

I am not considering the usual cliches uttered about the military-industrial establishment. I found it difficult to describe that in short space without using those particular words. But it is a fact that there are economic and social forces, there is a power structure, no matter what terms we use, which has conditioned the response of the educators and the educational system to the necessities of the society.

Clark Kerr's definition of the knowledge industry is one which I think one must accept, in that we have developed an attitude toward knowledge which is, on the one hand, utilitarian, and on the other hand, consumer-oriented. Thus, if we think of knowledge-producers and knowledge-users, we find that knowledge-users are usually conceived in terms of the economic and social advantage of the user, not in terms of the enlightenment for the culture which the dissemination of knowledge could contribute. I am pointing to an attitude which, in the main sweep of educational thinking, accepts the notion that the educational system itself is a means through which the individual can move to social and economic advantage. And I defy anyone in this room to deny this as a common assumption in public discussion, whether it be at PTA meetings or at the meetings of educators when these problems are discussed. This is a common assumption too often made on the part of educators themselves as to what the function of education is.

And in bringing this up, I did not mean to fall into the trap of simply identifying a massive power, something which Mr. Eisenhower's speech-writers term "the military-industrail complex." I don't like that term. I think it is a cliche. I think it disguises more problems than it illuminates.

I am not trying to say that we must treat all cultures as equally valid. I am not trying to create a mixture in the old-fashioned melting-pot sense, and I don't think that I wish to be subjected to Mr. Hook's criticism that I am naive in thinking that back in the '30's there was this glorious feeling that we were to use education as the instrument of social change, that teachers were on fire to inject into the social system their own idealism. Nor am I prepared to say that in the present situation the integration of the cultures is an end in itself.

I did point out that the purpose of integration is to give to each child his sense of himself, his sense of belonging to a total culture, and a sense that he is going to make his own community. Let me be quite specific.

Mr. Mayer has referred to the distortions and dishonesties of the new curriculum developed by some of the young people who have gone to Mississippi. I don't find distortions or dishonesty there. I have worked quite directly with the young people who have gone down there. I have seen the new curricula they are developing in the Freedom Schools.

I have seen the institutes which they have developed in which they are involving civil rights workers in the study of the structure of politics, society and economics in the South. I find these quite enlightened, honest statements of what the structure of the South is, and how we can teach people who cannot respond to the academic curriculum the facts about their own society and their own stake in it.

Anyone who reads the mimeographed materials which some of these young people have developed for teaching drop-outs in the South and in the city slums will have to agree that this is neither distorted or dishonest material. This is new, fresh material developed by non-professionals to deal with specifics. And I think if we had some of that attitude on the part of teachers in the big cities, who could work outside the big bureaucratic controls which exist in a city like New York or Chicago or Los Angeles, that we could have much more interesting and fresh materials to deal with. I think it is inaccurate to refer to these materials as being distortions or dishonesties of a new curriculum.

Finally, let me say quite specifically what I mean about the necessity of developing within the programs of teacher preparation new social attitudes. I could agree with everything Mr. Mayer said about the way in which teachers in New York City, Chicago and Los Angeles, simply to mention three cities sharing common problems, have been unable to cope with the problems in the classroom. And while I can agree completely that we must keep our objectives loose, and not talk abstract language about what the objective of the educational system is, I find Mr. Mayer's description about what can happen within the neighborhood schools a distortion of the fact.

Let me again be quite specific. On the south side of Chicago, there are college students and high school students who are teaching in the slums. They are doing the remedial reading things, they are teaching spelling, teaching algebra, they are teaching history. They are doing this out of a sense of duty, shall I say, out of a wish to move out of the particular parochial circumstances of their own lives into a larger community where the lives of the children whose circumstance they have been unaware of before give back to them some insight into what kind of lives they themselves were leading.

Out of these tutorial programs in the slums and in Mississippi have come a new kind of teacher, and out of the teaching the tutees themselves have then moved on to becoming tutors. Now, I see this as a variety of community development which is a necessary antecedent condition of creating a new attitude for teaching. And there is nothing more effective in the training of a teacher than to have him work with children unlike himself, and then to find that through his teaching he can develop in them those new tutors for the future who will then need more education in order to go on teaching. Some of the most successful tutors in the slums, from the northern student movement and from some of these new developments on the part of the college students, have come from those who, themselves, have been drop-outs and who have had their own problems to deal with, and therefore are better able to deal with the problems of other people.

I see as an inadequacy of the comments the refusal to accept a kind of primitive sense of idealism on the part of a new generation of high school and college students, some of whom are now preparing themselves to enter the Peace Corps, others who are the new recruits to be drawn into various kinds of domestic service corps, youth counseling and youth opportunity center staffs. There are more and more of these young people developing. That's what I mean by idealism. It's a motivation on the part of a new kind of high school and college sutdent whom we have not seen lately. And in those attributions to the life of the 1930's which have been considered both by Sidney Hook and Martin Mayer as being sentimental allusions by a guy ignorant of the situation, I would say that one does look back on the '30's with a sentimental liberalism which in a sense is unavoidable.

There were problems then which were hidden during the war years and in the 1950's. I say that these problems have now jumped into public consciousness for a variety of reasons, some of which I tried to describe here. But the fact of our relating the educational system to the social system is the main fact I wish to make. I will not defend here tonight my analysis of what was happening in the 1930's or in Sidney Hook's school 50 years age. I was referring mainly to their levelling and uplifting influence.

The lack of social context in educational thinking has

been apparent in public discussion of education. In those conferences designed to deal with the problems in economics and in the social system, I don't find the bite of informed intellectuals on the problem itself.

One of the reasons I feel that this conference is different from the others which have been conducted on these very problems is that the problems themselves are pointed to directly informed persons, whose research and personal experience bears on these issues. It's the absence of the kind of discussion we are having here, the kind of tough criticism which Sidney Hook and Martin Mayer have made of what I have had to say, which is lacking in the entire educational system.

ADDITIONAL QUERIES AND RESPONSES

Ernest van den Haag: I would like to ask whether I am interpreting correctly. When I hear the discussion of quality and equality, it seems to have come down rather squarely on the side of equality.

I think this is somewhat disguised by remarks about elite versus non-elite education. The word "elite" was here used, it seems to me, in a very equivocal meaning. Do you means, Dr. Taylor, that those who are more able to profit from learning should not be given the opportunity to learn more? This is what I though you might have meant by being opposed to elite education.

This is somewhat obscured, because it seems to me you don't make very clear whether you mean by "elite" those people who acquire a higher status, not because they have more opportunity to learn, or because they are more gifted, or more able to learn, but because of ascribed distinctions such as status.

To put it more specifically, don't you think that if we are to select people to go to a school of medicine or to study medicine, we should consider the people most gifted as future physicians first and most?

If we had an army, and we consider that in an army we need both officers and privates, don't you think that then we do need officers' schools, and that we will in a sense have an elite of officers? The schools should not be closed, but open to those who are gifted for the kind of leadership in the army or, for that matter, in a different form, in any profession in any society.

If I understood you correctly, you seem to be opposed to that thing. I think your position rests on a confusion of this sort of a need with hereditary or other kind of need. Let me add, of course, that the kind of opportunity for additional learning that would be involved, should not preclude our concern for those unable to profit from additional learning and that such education should be equal in many other respects. But as far as the strictly learning opportunity is concerned, are you really opposed to letting or helping the more gifted to learn more than the less gifted?

Harold Taylor: I'd like to respond to that on two levels. First, in my experience with students, the decision by a student, placed in the context of those who select him for further education, is usually one conditioned by cultural factors in his own environment. He wants to become an architect or a doctor or any one of other things for a variety of reasons, some of which are personal. I am arguing that our selection of those who are worthy of higher education demands a much more differentiated conception of quality than the one new current.

The one now current I find to be that of scholastic aptitude in a narrow sense. So that a good physician may or may not be one who is presently selected out by our kind of academic screening.

Let me relate that specifically to your analogy to the military services. Certainly there are those whose talents lie in a technical direction, and it would be foolish not to indulge the interests of those with the talents specifically designed for particular kinds of professions and occupations. But my experience in the Navy with the selection process of radar operators and officers indicated that most of the attitudes which the Navy took to recruits who could be moved into technical positions were culturally oriented rather than psychologically sophisticated. One of the tasks which I was privileged to undertake was to undo this fallacy.

It's that kind of experience directly with young people whose talents are as yet undiscovered which makes me believe that our major concern must be to adapt an educatinnal system to the particular situation of each child or each 17- and 18-year- old at that crucial point in his own career where becoming a member of an elite is not his problem. Moving from his present situation into another one more advantageous to him and to his total aim is the problem which he has.

I used elite in a pejorative sense to identify our society's tendency to distinguish between a mass culture and another group of entrepreneurs and managers who run the mass. The selection process for those who are going to enter the managerial and entrepreneurial class is at present not designed to give advantages to those most worthy of them.

Van den Haag: What you are criticizing, then, is the present selection process, and I would agree with you it is something far from perfect. But you are not opposed to elite education, rather you are simply opposed to the way the elite is being selected at the present.

Taylor: Let me enter on the second level which you have spotted immediately -- the conception of an elite itself. It's a word that I think is risky to use, since it is very difficult in the American vocabulary to define it with sufficient precision to make it meaningful.

Let's use another word -- the selection of those qualified for further education whom we identify by their being in the upper 50% of their classes. As a corollary we exclude the lower 50%. My notion is that we should not prevent further development on the part of the lower 50% by screening them out, but rather should develop new forms of teaching, using whatever insights we have into the curriculum, into new materials which can take the whole entering freshman class from where it is to where it could go. At the present time the freshman year in many places is considered to be a screening device to lose 30 to 40% of the beginning students on the grounds they weren't good enough to be there in the first place.

Now, it's in this context I am talking about the conception of an elite as referring only to those who have, at a given point in their lives, developed sufficient scholastic aptitude to be able to do the kinds of things which are done in what we call the quality institutions. This I consider to be a wrong-headed conception of what education is.

I believe the development of individual competence, intellectual interests, esthetic sensibility and sheer ability to handle ideas are among the major purposes of education. I don't make a distinction between greater and lesser degrees of the kind of talent which can variously be found among musicians or painters or sculptors or embryo physicians or architects. I find many ways of taking the raw material of a freshman class and, without having one conception of what talent is, employ a more differentiated conception of what quality in education is by adapting a new curriculum to whoever those people are. I think that would be my effort to answer your query about what the elite amounts to.

Sloan Wayland: I'd like to ask what "education" is referring to. Are we talking about higher education as well as schools? In Dr. Taylor's paper, and in many other papers, the focal point of attention apparently is on the school system. Now, I ask this question partly for clarification but partly because I am convinced that a generation age we could have focussed on the schools significantly without too much attention to college.

Today, however, it's a quite different kind of context, so that it's not possible any longer to talk about the school as if it were a separate kind of problem, nor to treat the curriculum of the school as if it were a separate kind of problem from that of the college.

I think it would be of value for us to see whether in talking about quality and equality we are concerned about the whole educational system, or about the primary and secondary schools alone.

Taylor: I specifically wanted to address myself to the whole system, and that is why I used the term "knowledge industry", to cover a whole spread of ideas having to do with the orientation of the public school as well as the university.

Robin Williams: I thought the thrust of Dr. Taylor's remarks with reference to the elite and others was not so much what kind of teaching we held out to the ones who could do well but rather to insure that we did not deprive those who did not do so well. I saw the idea that we strive more imaginatively and we have to insure that we do not block off those who are not in some special class. I wondered if this is correct.

Taylor: That is what I was trying to do.

Arthur Bestor: Throughout your paper, Mr. Taylor, you seemed to be making a dichotomy between a concern with education defined in academic terms, in terms of academic disciplines, and an education which will be concerned with society and social problems. I think that's a fair statement of the element in the paper.

Now, is it then your judgment that academic scholarship today is not sufficiently attending to the current problem? Are sociology, anthropology, history and economics very much concerned only with professional problems, and unconcerned with the world? If this is the case, which I have my doubts about, where are the schools to get the guidance that is going to take them out into society?

If, on the other hand, you do feel that the academic disciplines today are concerned with social problems, why is it a fault to try to bring the curriculum of the schools up in accord with academic discipline thinking on social problems today?

Taylor: I think your first statement is closer to what I feel in observing high schools and colleges; that is to say, that the academic disciplines are more related to the problems arising within the hierarchy of academic subjects than it is to the substantive content of issues in the society itself.

I find in the curricula of the high schools no sense of relevance between the work in social studies and the bigger issues under which the disciplines can operate in order to answer certain questions.

The questions themselves, I think you would agree, change from generation to generation. I don't find the curricula in these areas adapting themselves to those changes and the different set of questions being answered by the disciplines. This is particularly true in philosophy, where, instead of dealing with those concerns which affect moral and social values, the philosophers within the universities are talking about the semantic issues, the linguistics and other issues not relevant to developing within the student a sense of intellectual inquiry or inducing some of the values which are required if students are to develop what Mr. Hook referred to as a sense of democratic responsibility.

Now let me make a corollary statement in order not to be misunderstood. I have a terribly high regard for the sheer exercise of the intellect in difficult or easy materials. I have a great sense of concern that, within the reforms necessary in education, what we consider to be the scholarly disciplines are not considered as obstacles to the development of intellectual acuity. I prize rather more than a great deal of my colleagues in education that sense of relevance of the mind to itself, involving the sheer enjoyment of the exercise of the mind on difficult issues and the necessity of gaining a background of information and knowledge which can only be had by systematic study.

What I am concerned about is that at a given point the development of systematic knowledge about given areas within the curriculum has been pushed at students, without any sense of what they are ready for, what they can respond to, and on what level they can deal with the academic material. And it is very difficult to use the word "acadmic" as it is in the case of elite, without being misunderstood. Perhaps another word would be preferable. The systematic inquiry into various areas of organized knowledge is a key function of the schools and the universities. However, if those inquiries in those disciplined gathering together of bodies of knowledge are not done with some sense of relevance to what the major questions are, then they become quite useless and intellectually defeating on the part of students.

Marvin Bressler: We have been operating on the implicit assumption that equality is a useful goal. This is in fact what I believe.

At the same time, I would like to hear anybody or all of you discuss the sense in which this is true; that is, if equality is deemed desirable and inequality undesirable, it must be so in relation to either certain consequences or certain standards.

By what mandate of individual welfare or social function or ethical standards may we conclude that equality is a desirable goal to pursue?

Martin Mayer: Equality implies comparability in many of the areas of the things that we are talking about. You do have various mechanisms which enable you to reduce to baseless qualities what you are talking about. The most obvious is the market mechanism, which reduces everything to sums of money which are neutral and which are comparable. But if you are talking about the equality of a first-rate painter and a first-rate composer, you are not talking about anything that's significant or meaningful. And if you are talking about the equality of human beings, except in terms of an egalitarian income or the equality of souls; which becomes equally neutral in most people's hands, I don't think that you are dealing with anything that has a significance or a meaning.

What we are talking about, I suppose, is an equality of freedom of motion which is going to produce very unequal ends. It's supposed to produce unequal ends. We'd have a horribly dull existence if it did anything else. And the problem is that we operate in such a way as to give highly divergent freedoms of motion so as to yield very highly divergent estimates of quality. But the notion that you wind up with something so bland and mathematical and basically unpleasant as equality strikes me as a very unfortunate notion.

On the other hand, I wouldn't want to criticize the word, because almost any other word would be equally bad. If you use "equivalent", you are being pedantic. You would have something a little less objectionable as a word, but you would be one step closer to what we are talking about, I think, one step further away from the neturality that is implied in the word "equality".

Sidney Hook: I feel that is not very responsive to the question. In fact, I am bewildered by Mr. Mayer's answer. I think that this whole problem of equality is central; it isn't a matter of neutrality.

While we speak of the Negro revolution and we talk about the equality of opportunity, we mean something very important, something for which people are prepared to die.

Now, the meaning of equality in education is fundamentally moral and the genius of American education that distinguishes it from education everywhere in the world is our belief that every human being, every citizen is entitled to as much equality of opportunity as society can provide at a definite time. The aspiration is not altogether a guide to practice, but as our country developed, we have taken this ideal seriously, and it is involved with the whole question of elite education in the bad sense.

Years ago there were people who frankly said that they didn't care very much what kind of education the Negroes got or what kind of education the Jews got; they were interested only in the education or their own kind, their own class. And you can find other justifications besides the moral justification for emphasis upon equality in education, but this is fundamental. If you challenge this, then you are raising a moral question as to why equality of concern is preferable to special kinds of selectivity.

Let me put it this way in its perhaps most elementary sense. Parents in the family who are aware of the inequalities or the capacities on the part of their children are nonetheless equally concerned about each of their children -- the bright and the one who is not so bright and even the dull -- and no one is surprised at that, because we pre-suppose a feeling and an emotion of concern for all children.

Now, the democratic ethos really asserts that the same attitude that the parent takes to all of his children is the attitude that society should take to all it its children. You may regard that as naive and objectionable, but I think that's the basis of our commitment. And if someone wants to challenge that, then they must challenge it on some aristocratic notion. Very few people are prepared to do it on the basis of a pure principle of aristocracy. Even Plato maintained that through his educational system he was enabling all human being to find themselves in such a way they would have equal opportunity for happiness.

There is a tendency on the part of most people who reflect to accept the principle of equality of treatment as part of a theory of justice, so that when you treat people unequally, the burden of justification rests upon you. So that those who take issue with the democratic attitude in education would then have to offer some good reasons why we should treat some people unequally.

Judon T. Shaplin: Another element is our growing uncertainty about our ability to judge capabilities, at whatever age, and any kind of premature judgment that challenges a person in any particular direction. One of the things I sense in the immediate climate of the Negro revolt in the last couple of years, the emphasis upon pre-school, is an increasing uncertainty about this, and the growing realization of the way in which accidents of birth and early circumstance increase our uncertainty about knowing about children.

John W. Powell: I am increasingly disturbed by the sense that during the whole evening we have been talking about education in terms of the classroom curriculum and the educational testing service, whereas, we are actually talking about the future of a society.

One of the talents which the society requires, which is unpredictable and is demonstrably unrelated to marks in school, is the talent of leadership. No society can exist without leaders, no group exists without leaders. The talented leadership comes from what source we don't know. And yet every society will have leaders.

You know from your own experience that your best leaders in high school and college often come from your C-minus students and yet they will go on to be the nation's leaders. One very real question we have to deal with, then is how is the educational system going to see to it that the leaders of the nation are -- and we were very much for a while in danger of being in this situation -- that the leaders of the nation are not uneducated.

Hook: I thought you said that our leaders came from the C-minus students. Since we always have them, why should we worry about them?

Powell: Because we cannot afford uneducated leaders.

Hook: I'm a little suspicious of training for leadership in a democracy.

Powell: I mean how can you see to it that those who are going to be leaders are educated, not necessarily in terms of A's and B's?

Hook: Well, I could maintain that if you look at the presidents we have had, Truman and Eisenhower, you can make a good claim that you could just as well have election by lot in a democracy. And the Greek system of election by lot didn't work so badly, because they were all pretty well educated.

Powell: They kind of went under, I believe.

Hook: Yes, but not as a result of their education, because all cultures go under sooner or later, including our own.

Powell: Are we to take this for granted?

Hook: I think that if the second law of thermo-dynamics is valid, we can take it for granted.

Taylor: I'd like to shift to a technical question. The Soviet system of education makes extreme claims, as we do, for equality, and their system is organized under a 10- or 11-year program of free education. The technical means through which this concept of equality is applied consists of moving the children in the Soviet system through certain courses of study and through certain experiences controlled by the educational authorities, which are equal in the application. But their conception of equality is different from the one which I think is being advocated here, which adapts the educational system to the present situation of the people in a given community.

The thing that horrifies me is, if you go out to certain sections of the country and talk with the teachers in any given high schools, you will find that there is no national effort consonant with our claim to establish that adaptation of the educational system to the need for equality, which in our terms means a differentiated concept of quality at a given stage in the child's development.

What is needed at the moment is perhaps some more technical exercise in developing a conception of equality which doesn't fall into the fallacies which Mr. Hook is hinting at, which then deprives somebody of a chance to move through the social system, whether he is C-minus, A-plus, or whatever. And I believe if we keep ignoring these qualitative factors in the conception of equality, we are making a terrible mistake in that we are equating our system with a controlled system in which everybody will have to be equal, because they are all studying the same subjects.

Edgar Friedenberg: I've interpreted Prof. Bressler's raising of this issue as perhaps at least giving sanction to question the value of equality itself as always the paramount consideration or a dominant one when a choice involving a hierarchy of values has to be made.

I must say that comparatively few things that have happened to me that turned out to be agreeable or lucrative were ever done in the name of equality; quite the contrary as a matter of fact. And whether I wanted to favor it would depend on what one was being equal about, and what seemed to be lacking or needed in a social situation at a particular time. I don't think you can very sensibly be in favor of almost any value. I can think of none in which you can say, "Well, no matter what condition society is in, what problem it is facing, it's always going to need more this one". I think most of the time in history and most of the societies in which one might have lived has quite easily taught too little application of the principles of equality in most situations.

At this time I'd want to think of its countervailing in whatever I was dealing with. I am concerned, too, about there being no opportunity, unless there is meant to be, of asking the price of a particular value, even if you do agree that it is good. Equality in a particular educational context might still cost more of other things that I am trying, and I would be willing to relinquish and I am quite sure that it is true in a great many educational situations.

Taylor: Would you give an example of what you mean?

Friedenberg: Specifically, in curriculum I dislike having to work with materials that are made intelligible to a large number of people at the cost of what seems to me to be loss of meaning. I write enough for a variety of editors to know that in principle this principle is scarcely questioned. In society people can say, "Yes, I understand, but, by trying to be so subtle, you are simply putting it out of the reach of a large number of the people you might be writing for." All I can say is that is indeed one of the unfortunate consequences that I am prepared to accept.

What I really want is to say what I mean to whoever may happen now, or if the record is preserved, later, to be along who might understand it.

Hook: Aren't you confusing equality with the quantitative?

Friedenberg: No, I don't think so.

Hook: Well, the illustration refers to the quantity of the people. I could understand a written-down version of what you wanted to say, and I can't imagine any editor asking you to abandon your subtle expressions on the grounds that you were treating people unequally.

It is true that the term "equality" as a value by itself is never sufficient. It's quite clear when we say we can treat people equally that we can also mistreat people equally, and therefore there must be something else besides the equality of treatment. Usually equality as a value, as a social value, goes hand in hand with something which you may call social welfare or human happiness, and there are occasions in which justice will conflict with happiness.

But as far as education in concerned, you can't state everything. We presuppose a whole background here. When we talk about educational equality, we really mean broadening the opportunities for individuals who have been unfairly neglected or ignored.

Let's take an analogy in other fields to see this. When we speak of political equality in any particular context, we say "Now, we want not only ment to vote, we want women to vote. We want not only white men to vote but all men to vote". The assumption is that citizenship or the political aspects of the situation are such that we have approved them upon reflection, but the irreducible element of justice remains. That is to say, every child has a right to the development of his capacities.

Friedenberg: I don't want all men to vote. I don't want them to be restrained from voting, but I am delighted when they lose their way to the polls very often.

Hook: But you don't want to deprive people from voting, do you?

Friedenberg: No.

Hook: That's the important thing when we speak of the political equality. They should have the right to vote, all men should have the right to vote.

Mayer: I think we are coming back to what I was objecting to, that equality and diversity are in a sense logical antagonists and that you simply have to live with this. Certainly Prof. Hook does not propose to give equality of treatment to the youngest of the Rockefellers and some poor kids in the slums. Because their situations are diverse, you don't have equality of treatment. You have to do something else. Nor are we talking about putting them both through the Harvard Graduate School unless they have some aspect in which they are not diverse.

In talking about equality and justice, then, there is a very great danger of getting so far up in the air that you can't see what the animals are eating down below. We are very concerned here, I think, with the promotion of diversity and with the fact that people are very different from each other, and what equality means in this context is something very, very tricky and not easily to be taken into real terms. It always winds up on a very high plane.

Hook: May I respond to that? I think this is crucial, even though it involves a philosophical issue. See, this presupporition that equality entails uniformity or identity is what I am arguing against. In fact, what I am saying is that the moral meaning of equality, where human beings are concerned, is an equality of difference, that Negroes and whites and Jews and Gentiles are different, and we don't want to eliminate all these differences so that each one becomes shiningly indistinguishable from each other.

What we oppose to the melting-pot concept and 100% American concept is the assumption that equality involves a uniformity and identity and then a mediocrity. We say people can be different, human beings have different needs, but each one has an equal right to have his specific needs taken into account. The genius of modern education, as distinct from the past, it seems to me, is the awareness that education in some way must take account of the needs of the learner and to present what is desirable in the way of education to him in such a way that he grows with this material.

Seymour Harris: A few economic points. I think we have had bad economics here so far. I think that Prof. Hook needn't worry about the time when we will have to pay to do some work. I think he exaggerated this problem of automation and technology. I think most people in Washington say there have been no great changes in recent years, so I don't mean to say there aren't any problems here.

Now, in Mr. Mayer's discussion, the whole economic issue was rather minimized. I don't for one minute believe you can have a good educational system only by getting cash. If you put out more cash, you have to get more supplies or resources if you are going to do a good job. But I don't for one minute believe that it isn't important to get some cash.

There's been a tremendous increase in the amount of money spent on education, if you put on a per capita basis the number of people who are being educated, you will find an entirely different result. As a matter of fact, for example, in higher education, if you compare the amount of money spent per student with the rise of per capita income in the nation over a long period of time, you will find that actually the standards of higher education are considerably deteriorated in relation to what has been happening to the economy.

Mr. Mayer also said that we shouldn't try to measure the net results of education, that this is a silly thing to do.

I am not so sure, but I wish we could measure the results. A number of studies showed that Harvard, Yale and Princeton alumni had much higher incomes than alumni of other colleges. I would suggest that Harvard, Yale and Princeton do a wonderful job on their education. Although as one of the editors of the Harvard Crimson said when I suggested tuitions ought to go up, he said: should tuition go up because Mr. Harris says that Harvard education will give you so much income? And Prof. Harris says that the Aga Khan gets a million dollars' worth of income because he went to Harvard. That's not my position.

I did want to say when Mr. Taylor said something about the fact that we haven't solved our problems of distribution, unemployment, full production, poverty and so forth, I think that isn't exactly correct. I think we have done a great deal in these areas. This is a highly prosperous economy, with only 3% of the heads of families unemployed; and of all people who are unemployed, one-third of these people are only seeking part-time jobs. The unemployment problem isn't nearly as bad as people make it out to be, It is an important problem, but not nearly so bad as what Mr. Taylor has written.

Now a word about the tests. I don't think that the experts on tests aren't aware of the difficulties of tests. I am not sure they depend so much on tests as Mr. Taylor says they do. I know at Harvard they pay much more attention to what a student does in school, his grades, in school, and so forth, and what the principal says about him. But I also want to remind you of something that John Gardner says about testing in his brilliant book on excellence. He said he can remember the time when teachers judged their students by how much steak they had on their fingernails, or what their accent was. The introduction of tests did a tremendous amount to bring about fair treatment of students, and we mustn't forget that.

SESSION TWO

Theme: THE CHALLENGE OF GROUP DIFFERENCES

Introduction JOHN HENRY MARTIN i - iv

Theme Paper and Supplementary Comments PETER ROSSI 1 - 14 c

Discussion MARTIN TROW 15 - 22

Discussion MARTIN DEUTSCH 23 - 29

Response PETER ROSSI 30 - 31

Additional Queries and Comments 32 - 41

INTRODUCTION

by

John Henry Martin

I would like to exercise the chairman's prerogative to ignore a little bit of my function, everybody else having established that precedent very firmly, and speak as a school superintendent for a moment in these sessions.

The sources of the coming American revolution in education and the heavy pressure of the content of what's been said in the last two sessions, as if the revolution were going to come from within the institution itself denies, I think, all history. My grandfather used to say that the man who drove the horse and buggy was the last one to be aware of the fact that the automobile was here to stay. The horse-drivers of education are not about to become pilots of space vehicles in educational change.

On the other hand, I think the prospects of revolution are delightfully wonderful, because external to the institution of education are a whole series of forces, not the least of which we are exemplifying by being here and speaking in discontent. But in addition to that, in my more than 25 years in public office, I have never seen before so widespread throughout every factor and piece of the groupings of our society so universal a discontent coupled with a hope for education. The mass intellectual value system that says education must change has today penetrated into every segment of our society to a degree that I don't think has ever before existed in any mass culture or even small culture before.

Secondly, industry is discovering that there is gold in those poverty-stricken hills called schools and millions of dollars for the first time are being devoted to a technology of education. Skinner provoked it, and it's growing and it is spending huge sums of money. But there is a curious conjunction of $10,000 classroom teachers in the last major handicraft manual trade left in our society, called teaching with enormous investments by firms such as IBM, Borg-Warner, Westinghouse, and North American Aviation, pumping hundreds of thousands of dollars annually in an effort to produce a machine model for what we don't know how yet to do manually. These companies operate on the thesis that what you spend money for you are going to get. I think we shall see the arrival within the next five years of some very important technological capital investment items to supplant, augment, replace or increase the efficiency of the handicraft labor called teaching. And the public will buy, because we are a society committed to the fact that even what you can do well with your hands, it's better to do poorly with a machine -- witness the electric toothbrush.

Third, an item that I perhaps exaggerate as an ingredient of revolution is the fact that a self-styled intellectual elite in America, including suburban people who read the Saturday Review of Literature, the New York Post and the New Republic, and titilate themselves that this constitutes intellectualism, have in the past ten years developed and popularized a contemptuous snob attitude toward the second-class practitioner of public school administration called the superintendent. Perhaps I exaggerate this because of its personal context. But I posit this development as an ingredient for revolution.

Fourth, a by-product of this growth of contempt is the role of the Federal Government in such things as the poverty program. As a politican said to me, poverty pays today. So, fetish-like and fad-like, and I hope humanitarianly-engendered, millions and billions are going to be pumped into a poverty program.

As was stated here this morning by Mr. Shaplin, the basic view of how to intervene in the educational structure will be seriously effected by this wide-spreading belief in the inadequacy of the existing hierarchical administrator in public education. We are going to see, therefore, a proliferation of a whole series of institutions, completely aside from, to use the hackneyed phrase, mainstream of the public schools in the state departments of education.

Fifth, I would note a very significant and seemingly contradictory element to my proposition that the people in an institution are the last to generate the revolution.

The Talleyrands and the Lafayettes are an important ingredient of every revolution. That is, the "traitors to their class" is an ancient phrase from Rome as well as today, and, strangely enough, with some humor, I should point out to you the rise in militant unionism of the classroom teacher in this country. By that I don't meant AFT alone. I am talking of the newly developed competition of the American Federation of Teachers with the National Education Association. I was delightfully surprised to discover that the revolution is well on its way. Last week, for instance, delegates from both organizations laid before me their demands. This is a process of spy activity by each organization on the other to make sure that neither is undercut by asking for anything less than the other does, including last-minute editorial changes to make them sound more belligerent.

But I say to you this is evidence of a coming storm. I think of such things as the Utah situation, and a number of city situations, and the shock we experienced at the so-called Buffalo strike in the post-war period, in the middle forties.

The militancy of the teacher is now incorporating, as you saw in the New York situations, a long list of educational reforms.

Now, they are poor revolutionists because the reforms they will ask for will be always within the limitations of the thinking of the institution itself, or the establishment. But they are calling for multi-billion dollars of expenditures in terms of educational change. I would not discount this as simply one more finger on the rock of movement, because some heavy hands, some heavy levers of change, are pressing on the institution or the establishment called Education.

And so I would say to this audience that our over-concentration on the assumption that educational leadership is going to produce a revolution is historically naive, if not ignorant. However, to fortify you and to keep you from a complete sense of chagrin, my own feeling is, with some degree of joy and anticipation (I can hardly wait) the revolution is well on its way and the force in fact is now conjoining in vector operation on a single point called the Establishment. We are in for some explosive times.

Now I left out one more, and I saved it deliberately for the last, because there should be some bridge between what I've got to say and what we are here to talk about, and that is the role of the Negro.

The Negro's militancy and, as I like to say ironically, his irresponsibility in the selection of his leaders, in the inordinate nature of their non-Uncle Tomish demands, the impropriety of their haste, their lack of proper middle-class dignity in the prosecution of their sit-ins, is the first revolution I ever know that got started by the exploitation of people's backsides -- the sit-in. We have overlooked that, and we have also failed to recognize that the Negro is a special case and maybe belongs in the new category of handicapped, like cerebral palsy, the blind and the deaf, for all of whom some form of special education may be required. I take pleasure in my confreres' willingness to become excited about a whole host of educational reforms, which seems to me to be a kind of running away from the Negroes' insistence that the de-segregation of the schools should come first. As my Negro friends say to me, "You're trying to sell us -- we never bought separate but equal -- now you are trying to insist that separate but better is what we ought to accept." In any case, the whole pattern of pre-school education, of tutorial services, the notion of differentiated instruction, all of these things that are essentially not particularly germane to the need of the Negro are political expedients that are advocated as ways of handling Negro education. These belated expedients are due, I believe, to the political immovability of school boards and communities on the question of segregation.

And with that I'll ask Mr. Rossi to talk about his paper on group differences.

SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS
by
Peter Rossi

What I tried to do in my paper was two things: one is to outline some of the mechanisms whereby a lower class maintains its particular characteristics over time. Although in this historical period "lower class" means primarily Negro, at least in the rhetoric that we employ in the press and in social science, these are general characteristics which would, I think apply to Yemenites in Israel or to peasant immigrants to this country in the previous period.

The point was to make out some of these important mechanisms. And perhaps in an excess of zeal to point to massive differences, I emphasized, to begin with, the important effects of being poor, because everybody likes to talk about other things. It's not polite, apparently, in our society, to talk too much about money. But one of the massive differences between the Negro lower class in the urban industrial centers and the rest is that they are poor and that poverty shows itself up in a variety of ways.

Secondly, I talked about the effects of being lowest on the totem pole and knowing it; that to be lower class, and especially to be Negro in our society, is to be continually punished. One can escape from it by a variety of mechanisms. But the massive fact is that society devalues you and you know it, and in some degree you devalue yourself.

And then, thirdly, I tried to talk about the transmission system; that is to say, the way in which the characteristics of lower-class Negroes are passed on from generation to generation, emphasizing the importance of the earliest socialization experiences of the child.

This leads to the second part of the paper, which says: how can we break this vicious cycle? There is an important assumption which lies behind the second part of the paper, and that is that one should intervene in this particular case, rather than in previous cases. And the reason why one feels much more of a historical necessity at this particular point is that history is going much faster than the ordinary slap-dash means of assimilation of this group into the population will allow.

I am a great admirer of American public schools. I think they have done a marvelous job. I think it's very characteristic of Americans and American professions of one kind and another to have a very strong ingredient of self-hatred. Self-hatred comes out here and provokes people to hate them in addition, because nobody likes people to hate themselves.

But the schools, if you'll look historically, have done an extraordinary job, perhaps painfully. Certainly I felt that it was painful. The schools teaching me English in New York City when I was six years old was an extraordinarily painful experience. But they have done a job, and the problem is that we can't wait for change over two or three generations at this particular point. I am making that assumption, although I am sure that one can question that particular assumption and say we do have the time. But for the moment let's assume that we don't have the time.

The three points at which I think that intervention can be made are: 1) in the early socialization of the children, to remove the functional socialization out of this private sector of individual households to some kind of socialized socialization;

2) if it is at all possible, to apply supplementary diets during school;

3) the final recommendation talks about liquidation of the lower class all together.

Here I'd like to elaborate just a little bit. The question arises: can you get rid of the low man on the totem pole? I think the answer is that you can, and I would like to indicate some recent findings which indicate that this is possible, and indeed has been occurring in this country over time.

The findings are as follows: Over the last 20 or 30 years, actually 40 years since George Counts did a study back in 1922 or 1923, we have had a rather lengthy series of studies of occupational prestige in this country, and over the last decade there have been studies in about 30 different countries of the prestige standings of occupations.

The results are extraordinarily fascinating in the sense that over time and across countries, by and large, these prestige standings of occupations are fairly identical. Now, that means that from 1925 to 1964 in this country we have stable prestige standing of occupations. These positions are literally identical, despite the fact that there has been a considerable shift in the composition of the labor force.

What does this mean? Suppose we took a distribution of prestige, low to high, and plotted the percent of the labor force at various positions. (Dr. Rossi now illustrates his points with various graphs.) In 1925, perhaps, we had distribution like this; that is to say, by and large the great bulk of the population were occupying occupational positions which had relatively low prestige as seen in 1925 and as seen still today.

However, we have removed a great number of these occupations from our labor force. We have gotten rid of a great many unskilled jobs, so that the picture now looks something more like this, let's say, in 1964. If we look then at a peasant society, let's say Costa Rica, where we have information, it probably looks something like that. There are a large number of peasants, call this a peasant society. So that what these curves indicate is that there can be a shift in the amount of prestige in a system and the distribution of prestige in the system such that there is not always an invariant rank order.

There always has to be somebody on the bottom; there can be lots more people on the bottom. There can be a shift in the increment of prestige as far as occupational positions are concerned over time and over countries.

This leads to the notion that you can actually liquidate the lower class in the sense of making a larger number more homogeneous and bringing the mode of prestige of ranking up a bit further and shifting the distribution. One can imagine the egalitarian society looking, perhaps, like this -- a society which would be more egalitarian than our own.

Now, if that's the case, then some of the characteristics I have talked about, about being low man on the totem pole, are historically conditioned, are a consequence of our past and we could actually think of a society in which there is a considerable more homogeneity in this respect than exists at the present time, and indeed such a society appears to be the situation that is coming in the future.

DISCUSSION
by
Martin Trow

I'd like to take as a dual text Peter Rossi's and Boris Ford's suggestion this morning that we need to search for the effective levers of action that will, as he put it, lift the biggest load. He also slipped in a metaphor about dynamite, and maybe I'll get around to that.

I think Rossi's paper is an effort to identify some strategic points for applying pressures, and it struck me that Ford can identify exams as the strategic point of leverage in the English system. I think we are still looking for our strategic points, and I think our job is harder because our system is both more heterogeneous and more de-centralized.

With enormous effort we've reformed or have begun to reform the school system in the town that I live in--Berkeley--enormous pressure on a strategic point of leverage and a brick moved, but nothing else in the Bay area.

I think it is also harder in this country because we are now asking more of our schools than the English do, and what we ask of our schools affect our search for the levers of action. What we are now asking of education is related to a changing conception of equality of educational opportunity in this country.

Perhaps you know Anthony Crossland's distinction between a strong and a weak conception of equality of educational opportunity. The weak conception, the traditional liberal view of equality of educational opportunity would remove all external barriers, birth, and wealth, which would handicap the transition of intelligence into academic achievement and then career achievement. In that view, intelligence is more or less fixed largely genetically, or at least treated as if it were so, and the demand is that able boys and girls of humble birth be given access to decent education. In England it would be grammar schools and a university, if they can show that they are able, and that's perhaps why they are so concerned about their examinations.

The strong conception of equality of opportunity sees intelligence as itself achieved and calls for equalizing the opportunities for gaining intelligence. The demand is much more radical in its implications, since much of intelligence is acquired or aborted in the family. Thus this doctrine calls for quite active measures to help the family help its children, however much we are inclined to flee from those who come to help us, and further measures to supplement families' efforts through what might be called compensatory socialization. This is a commitment to help the child, despite the family's inability or indifference or, even, it's active opposition.

I think the United States, at least in its institutional leadership, is increasingly committed to the strong conception of equality of opportunity, and that in part is what I think the election was about. This was not always the case in this country. Certainly Jefferson's proposal to sift the rubbish heap for the few ablest youth of humble origins was very similar to the weak conception of equality of opportunity expressed in the Education Act of 1944 in Great Britain. The Act made a major institutional but not a major conceptual change in British education by establishing a free -- although dual -- secondary system for all for the first time.

It wasn't even the case in the United States during the growth of secondary education between 1890 and 1940. That was a kind of transition from the weak to the strong concept of equality of educational opportunity in this country, and closer to the weak than the strong.

There the doctrine appeared this way: the longer educational doors remain open, that is, the less selective are institutions, presumably the more attenuated are the influences or the handicaps of lower-class birth. Thus the free comprehensive secondary school system gave more time for native talents to demonstrate themselves and to qualify their carriers for higher education. But this attenuation of influence of birth over time in school only operates if the deficiency in the home is, in some sense, cultural or not, for want of a better term, motivational or more profoundly psychological. When it is only the former that's the case, the poor but ambitious boy may need more time to translate his talents in achievement, using the school, the free public library, whatever other equipment is around. But the society and the school need do no more than provide the time and reasonable facilities, and talent presumably will realize itself, even in the face of a culturally alien or impoverished home, indifferent teaching, boring textbooks, obsolete curriculum, and all the rest of it.

A basic difference between the weak conception of educational opportunity and the strong is the difference in the demands it makes on the schools for the success of the student. Under the weak concept, whatever else might have been said about it, the student's failure basically is placed on his own shoulders. Under the strong concept, the student's failure is seen as a failure of the schools or the teachers, and this is what people have been calling for from time to time, yesterday and today. This makes, of course, much severer demands on the school and the teacher. I think it in part accounts for the new concerns for educational reform for our searchers of ways to intervene in our search for levers.

Parenthetically, I don't agree with Professor Shaplin on one point, though I did with much else of what he said: that our colleges will next be subjected to the kind of searching criticism now being applied to the public schools, and especially the urban slum schools. The reason for this is that at the point of entry in college we begin to apply the weak concept of equality of education and educational opportunity. We are there, from that point on, realizing talents, not creating intelligence.

In California, for example, the new junior college in this sense much more closely resembles the old comprehensive high school. It gives even more time for talent to emerge from behind environmental handicaps, but it is not yet seen as trying to create intelligence in a compensatory or a clinical way.

This new widespread acceptance of the strong concept of equality of education is, I believe, closely connected to the new recognition of the lower-class urban Negro as a major social, moral, political problem in this country, emerging this way after the war. The crisis of the rapidly growing numbers of Negroes in our cities, the crisis of the central society, the Negro revolution, their demands for better education in the North as well as in the South, coupled with evidence that group differences between Negroes get bigger the further along they go in the school generates this new conception.

This latter evidence was a shock to the weak conception of equality of educational opportunity, and to the faith in the operation of an automatic escalator for new groups coming in at the bottom of the society. The earlier educational system had a lot of prestige for having coped so well, at least reasonably well, perhaps very well, with the mass immigration of the period between the Civil War and World War II. In a sense, I think the lower-class Negro in the North was its first highly visible failure, apart from Sputnik, for which I think it was unfairly blamed.

The post-war recognition of the slum child in an affluent society, the culture of poverty, the persistent effects of slavery, discrimination, degradation, exploitation resulting in handicaps to lower-class Negro children -- more profound than those of children of European and immigrant groups -- all of these led to an institutional commitment to the strong conception of equality of opportunity. This commitment requires the schools increasingly to see themselves not merely as the arena where talent is realized and then reveals itself, but where, indeed, for some children it has to be created and nurtured against strong counter-forces in the child, his home, and his range of opportunities in the society. This conception is by no means universally accepted as yet, either by the general population or by all teachers. I suspect it's held by increasing numbers of educational leaders. But I think that the fact that it is accepted by only some of the educational establishment is a source of some educational problems. And the fact that it is not accepted wholly in the population at large is a source of a considerable political problem.

Professor Rossi accepts, as I do, this conception of the role of education in relation to the lower-class Negro. As he notes: "The challenge of group differences to contemporary American educational systems lies in the fact that they are expected to deal effectively with groups whose characteristics are those of poor ability, scanty knowledge, and low levels of motivation, at levels of deficiency far below those 'normally' encountered in dealing with the 'standard' American school population."

And he goes on to say: "For the practitioner the answer to how to intervene in order to reduce the spread of differences in the general population is given largely through an understanding of the same mechanisms in which the social scientist has a more academic interest."

He is not saying here: how can we create better opportunities for able youth to reveal themselves; but how to reduce group differences, intervene directly in the school in ways that will create intelligence and not simply provide opportunities for it to be demonstrated. This raises the question of where are the levers of action which can be exerted on the variety of mechanisms underlying the wide group differences in school performance and realized abilities.

I would simply like to review for a moment some of the kinds of diagnoses and prescriptions for lower-class children in their education that are being made, and I want to locate Peter's suggestions in this frame and at the end raise a couple of questions with him about why he makes these suggestions and not some others.

It seems to me some of the sources of difficulty and points of intervention can be broadly grouped as within the school and outside the school system.

Within the school it seems to me the interest has to be laid primarily on the quality of instruction, and secondly, the climate of teaching and learning. One important aspect of the quality of instruction is the quality and

and competence of teachers. Questions are raised about their recruitment and retention in slum schools and proposals are made to recruit more able people and retain them. Questions are raised about their salaries and how that affects recruitment and retention in the competition for able people.

Much has been said about the creation of a hierarchy within the teaching profession which would allow people to pursue a career in teaching. It has been suggested, in fact, that the function of team teaching is to provide precisely that hierarchy within the teaching profession that would allow able people to achieve recognition and wider responsibility and higher pay.

I think it was Keppel who said we can't pay a million and a half teachers 10, 12, 13, or $15,000, but we might be able to pay this kind of salary to 200,000 teachers. This idea seems to conceive of team teaching as a device for retaining teachers in the schools. Mr. Schaefer's suggestion of tying in teaching and research is also a means of improving quality of the teacher and his investment. Various suggestions are made about the differential rewards, both material and psychic for teaching in difficult circumstances -- including, for example, a Domestic Peace Corps.

Secondly, proposals are made about the training of teachers. It is suggested that it would be helpful if they were more familiar with the special problems of slum children and slum communities. I sympathize here with Mr. Mayer's observation that there may be dangers in sociology as a justification for failure in the school, in the slum school. One learns many good reasons why it's very difficult to have any great success.

Other suggestions include educating teachers in new approaches to the teaching of culturally-deprived children. Among others, Strodbeck and Moore, as well as Mr. Deutsch, have interested themselves in this question, in such things as NDEA Summer Workshops.

Quite a different approach to the quality of instruction has been not through the teacher but around her by way of the new modes of instruction. There are notions of introducing teachers' aides, new technologies, television and programmed instruction as ways of improving the quality of instruction without improving the quality of the teacher, his motivation, his ability, or anything else. This is an attempt to rationalize the instruction, rather than improve the skill of the handicraft workers.

A third aspect of the problem arises out of the fact that teachers and administrators define the teaching situation as hopeless. There are many observations of this sort by people who are familiar with this problem. The teacher's expectations are important factors in the performance of her students. We hear of patronizing, of lowering of standards in slum schools, of routinization and a withdrawal of energies, of weary pessimism, of fear and hatred of the students because of the teacher's own stereotypes. All of these things are seen as problems to be dealt with, as a place where we might conceivably intervene.

One of the points that is perhaps most central here is the possible emergence of a culture of defeat among teachers in slum schools into which new teachers are brought and socialized, so that fresh energies and enthusiasms quickly are punished by old-timers.

I think that various people have observed that school records, especially intelligence tests, which misread measures of achieved intelligence as measures of potential intelligence, contribute to these stereotypes. In fact, I understand that in New York such tests are not being used. It seemed to me even more inventive to invent scores on intelligence tests, lie about them, and see what the consequences might be for the encounter between teacher and student.

The possibility of educating teachers to neutralize such misconceptions has also been suggested. I think that's tried widely. However, in Detroit Marlberger suggests that exhortation and training doesn't have much effect on these stereotypes.

Another possibility in this direction is the creative use of the Hawthorne effect to modify or break into this culture of defeat, or, one might transform this task into a new mission such as is embodied in the concept of a domestic peace corps.

A whole area within the school is the climate of instruction, and this area is still largely unanalyzed. The question here, as it's been put by people like Allen Wilson and Natalie Rogoff and John Michael at Columbia is: does this climate or undercut the efforts of the school in teaching? Relevant to this are studies of the impact of class and racial ratios, i.e., mixing of various levels of cultural sophistication, motivation and aspiration, of which class and race are crude indicators. A concern with the effect of racial and class ratios in school lies behind some of the pressure against de facto segregation. I think we don't know yet -- this is not necessarily an argument to use against efforts to modify segregation -- but we don't at all know what desirable ratios are at different grade levels or in different communities or under different teaching arrangements.

We know the mix has some effects on aspiration and performance. We don't know yet how its effects vary under different conditions or what the mechanisms are through which it has its effects. It is suggested, in order to modify this mix, that we modify housing laws, districting policies, streaming or tracking policies.

We don't know yet, for example, to what extent a given racial ratio within a school, but not within a track, has the effects that we anticipate. To what extent does having it absent from the immediate educational experience of a student insulate the student from the effects of that application?

But there ought to be other criteria of importance than the fact that a particular question captures my fancy. What are the criteria by which we decide to do research in this area and to take action in this area? Is this question of racial and class ratios a peculiarly vulnerable and promising one for its effects on students? If one thinks so, if one makes the partial commitment of doing research on it, then we have to explore to what extent racial and class ratios affect friendships outside of class through personal influence within the school but not within the track. Do they operate to provide students with models of higher performance? Do they make teachers teach, since there have been new sets of demands introduced in the school? Do they get more teacher attention?

In other words, if we look at the mechanisms through which this sort of large institutional arrangement might have its effects, those mechanisms through which class and racial ratios operate would point to different treatment strategies. This is especially true in large urban cities, such as Manhattan, where it becomes increasingly difficult to change class or racial ratios.

Anyway, I point to that as another area of concern about the way to intervene. Other possibilities include manipulation of a curriculum to break into the routine, the resignation, the boredom and apathy of both teachers and students, and to provide conditions under which teachers and administrators can use their imagination.

This points to a whole set of potential areas of intervention within the school. Rossi makes his suggestions primarily outside or in addition to the school as it is ordinarily constituted. I think we can look here at interventions directed at the child, those directed at his parents and the community, and those directed to the economy of the larger society.

In the first category would fall pre-school programs such as the boarding school suggestion that he makes and which I think is a very good idea. Higher Horizons programs to some extent are extra-school. These are various forms of compensatory socialization which Rossi suggests are required to break into the vicious cycle whereby lower-class families produce lower-class adults who, in turn, produce another generation of lower-class individuals.

Efforts directed to the parents and the community are represented by Mr. Shepard's work involving the attack on low aspirations and standards among parents in the community. They are also, in a way, represented by Alinsky's work in the Woodlawn organization in Chicago, and even Mobilization for Youth.

The kinds of questions I would ask here are: what are the effects, if any, of these efforts on the education of children in these communities? And, secondly, what are the mechanisms through which these programs have whatever effect they do have? Third, assuming the answers to the first two, what difference does it make if the focus of such efforts is on the self-improvement of the Negro community or if it's directed at an external enemy? What difference does it make which of these efforts are directed at the parents and adults in the community, and which at the children?

We know more about the effects of the economy in society. Here Rossi has suggestions about negative income tax, a decent floor under the income of lower-class families, inventing new occupations, a whole set of large legislative suggestions aiming at abolishing discriminatory practices and creating full legal rights -- the whole agenda of the civil rights movement would be available here.

There is another set of possible interventions that haven't been mentioned. These are neither within the school nor outside the school system, but refer to the structure of the organization of the school system itself. I wonder to what extent, for example, we can identify the centralization of decision-making as a factor in the effectiveness of education within the schools that make up such a system, or the size of individual schools or the role of local school boards in a large school system. Is there a problem arising out of central control versus local autonomy?

We can perhaps identify or locate these suggested points of intervention in this way: first, is the intervention to be done through the teacher or apart from the teacher? Is the intervention in school or outside the school? Most of the suggestions that I have reviewed can be located here. We have had various observations and suggestions about teacher recruitment and training. Here the whole set of new modes of instruction, most of them concerning the division of labor within the teaching profession -- which I interpret as efforts to improve the quality of instruction apart from the quality of the teacher.

Now the questions I want to ask are these: First, what are the priorities among the possible interventions? What are the bases for deciding the question of priority? Should the bases be the evidence we have, the costs, the political pressures, or what other combination? And what are the relative merits of focussed efforts versus what is, I think, in practice now. Is there any danger in the latter case of a dilution of energies and efforts hitting here and here and here, all across the board?

And finally, why does Professor Rossi seem to offer interventions mainly outside the existing school?

DISCUSSION
by
Martin Deutsch

I have changed what I intended to discuss largely because so much of it has either been stated, covered or touched on, that I feel it necessary to more or less free-associate to some of the issues that have been raised here.

I strongly agreed with just one point in the paper we are discussing today. This relates to the general discussion last night of some of the social influences that are operative here, namely, that equality in education in terms of early immigrant groups was not the factor that it is today. It has become a critical factor because there has been such a change in the job market and the kind of skills that are necessary if people are to be employed in our society and if we are to attenuate social discontent.

I think one has to recognize this. Education, by and large, has not initiated the movement toward quality. I have some doubts if this movement is occuring because of humanistic or moralistic qualities, or because of the secondary status and caste of Negro, Mexican-Americans, Indian-Americans and many whites in this country, or whether it is a response to very real social change.

When we use the term "revolution", I think we use it often in a very promiscuous manner. The revolution has a way of getting digested by the establishment and being converted into everyday routine. I don't know that t the discussions that we have had now and that we might have had ten years ago or that we will have ten years from now are necessarily different, though we have changed to some extent the terminology we have been using.

I think we have come more and more to recognize that intelligence is not an immutable quality. It is something which is subject to change through social intervention. Society can organize its institutions of change in such a way that it can give people opportunity for a greater development of intellectual potential than it has in the past.

If our present system allows us to accomplish this, what are some of the major handicaps? In the past, we have had a system that looked upon intelligence in terms of geno-typical factors. You might say it was a negativistic rationalization for intellectual performance based on a belief in the indigenous limitations within the organism.

Today we tend to place responsibility on the social system and most specifically the school. I think this is most appropriate.

We have a confluence of events: a new technology, the utilization of automated self-teaching machines, a new curriculum. And yet we have in many respects two cultures operating simultaneously.

When I attend conferences like this, I get the feel that the discussion at the conferences and the discussion that takes place back on the school district level are quite different: much of the differencesseems to be due to different interpretations of the research and the exploratory ideas that are available in the behavioral sciences and in education.

For example, consider the model of intervention implied in the so-called pre-school program. In my judgment, this program, to a ridiculous extent, has been conceived of as the main agent of change. Of course, it can only be an agent of change if it is built in with continuity to what happens to the child later on his terms of the school experience. It must be fully meshed in and articulated if it is to have any significance.

There are developmental reasons why we should intervene at as early an age as possible in terms of the exploration and development of conceptual skills and language capabilities. But I would be extremely pessimistic as to the over-all effectiveness of these programs if they do not have three essential qualities built into them.

One is the quality of articulation with what happens later on. For example, there arekabout 400 proposals now at the Poverty Office for pre-school education. But many of the communities don't have any kindergarten education and don't have plans for it. Obviously, therefore there is going to be a disturbing hiatus. M

More important than that is the interpretation of the kinds of things that should go into the new curricula and the kinds of changes that must be made in teachers and in the system itself.

One must consider, for instance, the training of the teacher in terms of the utilization of new methodologies and in terms of the teacher having an adequate concept of the developmental levels that an individual child has reached.

For example, if you are talking about memory function, you will have some children who will be at a certain place and a certain point in time in their ability to handle two, three, or four digits or the alphabet. If we are speaking in terms of specific labeling, different children will be at different levels. Now, there are methods by which this material can be fed back and forth between the teacher and student and become a very exciting instructional device.

Consider, too, another problemthat is sometimes referred to as the boredom barrier. The boredom barrier takes place when teachers come into the school situation having low expectations as to the functioning of the children and relate only to that segment of the class which is able to give them the kind of answers that they want, and in the middle-class language the teacher insists on speaking.

Special problems arise for the teacher of lower-class origin who is now middle-class and goes into the school situation with a conscious or unconscious rejection of the constricted type of language format that Bernstein has spoken about in his General Nosology of the Social Class and Language Development.

The question of interpretation is extremely important here. Do we just start these programs? Is money automatically equated with success? Or do we nedd tooling up? Do we need time for the development of ideas? Do we need time for prototype situations to be established so that they can be introduced into the major system?

What's happening now is that the major intervention models are being perverted by introducing them into the system at much too rapid a pace, without the kinds of training, orientations and equipment that are absolutely essentialy

This has certain probable ramifications. In five or ten years, if we have adequate evaluation (maybe, fortunately, we do not), many of the current programs are going to be complete failures and the children, for whom we are now pouring millions of dollars into special programs, will not show the kind of progress that should be possible.

To some extent we should have been, ten or twenty years ago, at the point that we are now. At that time we had an opportunity to do some of the basic research that is starting only now, and that will supply the foundation for the kind ofiintervention models which can be most successful and most specific in terms of establishing adequate motivational patterns and an adequate response toward the learning situation, both in terms of the teacher and the child.

I would hope that the question of patience in time is seriously considered. I would like to see the educational aspects of the Poverty Program go to revolutionizing the Office of Education. Funds should be made available through the Office of Education, not through Poverty, which does not have the trained or sophisticated staff necessary to recognize that we have a long-term problem. We're not going to get rid of the inequalities in American education tomorrow.

I [illegible]thought of myself as having certain revolutionary tendencies. I like things to be done, but I prefer them to be done correctly. One needs positive feed-back, or else we will not have the kind of reinforcements from the teacher, the superintendent, and from the child that are absolutely necessary.

With the new programs, the process of alienation begins even earlier now. Instead of going in at five or six, children go in at three or four. The teacher is not ready to assume the kind of responsibility for stimulating children that is necessary. There is an absence of investigation, of research, of communication with the teachers who are in the school. The result is that children are not really being reached in a very meaningful manner.

We can develop intervention models over time that can work on a mass basis. Our question really is: how does one translate from the prototypical model to the mass model? I think we have not adequately dealt with this issue. And, as I said before, I think we have often taken the facade of change, the symbols, the vocabulary, but we have not taken the intrinsic aspects that are necessary for real curriculum change, although there are some very positive things that are operating in terms of change.

We have found that there is a very real change in terms of motivation. Lower-class parents are extremely motivated. They don't know the mechanisms by which their children learn, they don't know how to interpret it, but they want learning, they want education, they want books. You can introduce them to books and they will accept books, but it has to be done by an essentially sympathetic teacher who is oriented to some of the sociological aspects and some of the developmental learning problems of the child.

To an astonishing degree, parents have been willing to cooperate in the over-all process in spite of the extent to which they have often been alienated by the anachronisms in the school system which prevent the establishment of the kind of bridge necessary for a meaningful sense of participation.

Issaid before that we do not have sufficient evaluation of many of these programs. In terms of the funding, it's been toward programming and not toward evaluation. But even where it has been toward evaluation, it has been incorrect. It has been evaluation of output variables; an evaluation of performance, not evaluation of process; not evaluation of where learning takes place or how it takes place.

For example, in one population, over the last three years, we've found that on the question of concept formation, lower-class children had a significant decrease from 3.9 years of age until 6.2. The race factor was not significant. But in the language factor there had been, with certain special intervention, a significant increase in performance. It's this kind of specific focused evaluation we are concerned with.

When we looked at the program we found that we had a very nice model for various routines in conceptual behavior, but that somehow it just wasn't put into practice. The teachers would try it for two or three weeks and sometimes it worked, sometimes it would not work. Then they would move on to more routinized nursery school methods that are less cognitively oriented. It was extremely unfortunate.

Another kind of thing that happens is this. We have a group of 80 children who are now in the first grade, and have been what we consider, with all its limitations -- and it has a lot of limitations -- a model kind of operation, since they were three and a half years of age. Out of this group two of the three teachers were disappointed. They said, "We've never had a group of children coming from the slums that are so bright, that ask so many questions. We can't keep them quiet. We are unhappy." One asked to be moved out. She didn't want it; it was too difficult. The principal said, "Well, I can't replace her" and kept her in there. Now we are very much worried about what's going to happen to this group in this kind of situation.

Another one found it just very difficult. She liked order and these children have been taught to cluster together in terms of various competence groups, They help one another and play with a lot of the automated machinery and other things we have been trying to introduce and they find little sub-learning groups. Well, this is very different from the usual process. It;s true the physical structure of the classroom has changed. In the kindergarten and in the pre-school we had a large space. Now when you get up you dis- e concert to some extent the whole operation. As a result, there is a great deal of discontent on the part of many of the children, reflecting, of course, the feelings of the teacher.

There is another aspect of this that comes out, namely, the tendency of the teacher to anticipate from which children she will secure the correct response and to give these children cues. In an analysis of the response patterns we found something like 80 percent of all inquiries are directed to certain children. Where the teacher can anticipate which children know the correct response, or at least the likelihood of their knowing, the correct response is reasonably great.

We have found that when we tried to change this, id didn't work initially. First, the teachers denied it, so we used movies. Then we found that something else was happening. Some of the teachers, when dealing with children where they did not anticipate successful response, would mimic, when it was a one-word-type response. The child would pick up the mimic cue and respond correctly. But, of course, no learning took place.

We found, again, that teachers did not accept this, but when wer were able to show them the movie, they said, "My gosh, we do do this." And, again, I think the utilization in terms of teacher-training of self-training evaluation techniques, where one sits down, analyzes what is happening, and plays back the movies, is very useful. Of course, it's something that's not included generally in the kind of funding being made available in these programs, for they are conceptualized as massive and immediate rather than as the kind of thing that has to be developed over the next ten or twenty years. This longer time perspective is indispensable if we are successfully to change educational processes and if we are to make good use of what we are beginning to learn in the behavioral and educational sciences about learning to learn and how children go about learning.

I want to mention one other aspect that strikes me as extremely interesting. For a number of years we have been doing a study of race, social class and deprivation, and we find that there is a deprivation cluster. This consists of a number of items in verbal interaction in the home, dilapidation o of the home, presence of a father in the home, attitude toward education, etc.

These are more significant than social class or race; race does play a significant factor in determining performance outputs. Social class seems to be a fac tor in a population of 300 at the .05 level, but the deprivation index cuts right across. Whether it exists within the middle-class or within the lower-class, there are greater frequencies in the lower-class cells of people who have deprivation-type experiences and the determination of the way in which these deprivation experiences operate is indispensable if we are to have any real chance to develop an effective intervention model that we can take into the home.

Many of these parents are extremely cooperative when you give them books, when you carry on role-playing situations where you help teach them to ask questions and to answer questions in an elaborative manner in terms of the linguistic organization of verbal responses rather than in a constricted way.

I think this can be extremely important to us. To me it indicates that thereaare identifiable specific environmental factors that significantly depress intellectual performance. Knowing these, one can intervene both at the home level and at the school level, and link the two in a meaningful way, so that one can get the kind of change and the kind of growth that is necessary if we are to meaningfully talk about equality in education.

I'd like to say more about the boredom barrier, because I consider it important in terms of the role of the teacher. It's a mutually reinforcing thing. The teacher gets bored, the child gets bored, and instead of a learning situation you have a non-learning situation. Very often where fancy money is going you find that you have a program that is really only a facade. You do not have anything that's really happening in terms of the actual dynamics of the classroom situation and learning on the part of the child.

One of the ways of breaking through on this -- and the suggestion originally came from a paper called "Inquiry Training" that was done by Dick Suchman at the University of Illinois -- is the emphasis on the formulation of questions on the part of the child to the teacher, actual training to ask questions about the environment and about experiences. We have found that teachers trained within the regular institution find this very difficult except on a personality basis. Some of them respond immediately, but too many find it a different kind of situation. But those who, with training, start responding, also begin to get the kind of reinforcement that breaks through the boredom barrier. The systematic study of inquiry training, I think, will play a very important role in the further development of intervention models and in determining to some extent the climate of instruction.

I would like to see a climate where, if many of the present programs do not have the success we anticipate, we are able to build in over a long-range the kind of technology and the kind of curricula that are most appropriate.

And, as I say, I think this is going to involve the evaluation of process more than the evaluation of output. I hope that there will be funds available for this, even though it will not have the social pay-off that, unfortunately, is often being demanded today, and the pay-off is often being asked for in the next few years. I do not think that's possible, as we have not sufficiently systematized the knowledge that is currently available.

RESPONSE
by
Peter Rossi

I think I'd like to say something first with respect to what Marty Trow said. I deliberately left out the school system for two reasons: one is that I was very much impressed with Ben Bloom's work showing how much of the variation in intelligence in an individual occurs in this pre-school period. I was therefore betting that intervention in this area would have the largest payoff in the long run. A second reason is that educational research shows that by and large if you factor out the input characteristics of students, the output characteristics of institutions are somewhat indistinguishable -- a fact which Mr. Conant neglects to mention.

It's very easy to make a good school in Skokie, Illinois or Scarsdale, or, if you will pardon the expression, Mr. Vernon, but it's much more difficult to make increments of a sort.

I think the general strategy is to make these kids middle class; that we can, by and large, dispense with the lower class in our society. They don't like themselves; we don't like them. They may have some nice qualities that, in a kind of romantic sense, we admire. But they don't admire them and as soon as they can get out of the lower class they manage to do so. The trouble is nobody has been giving them any exit signs or the means by which they can move.

To turn to Mr. Deutsch's comments, certainly whatever is done on the pre-school level should not be done hastily. There is a favorite platitude among researchers which goes as follows: you will never get anywhere unless you do some research on what you are doing. Well, it's such a platitude now that I am going to say to you you don't have to do research. I'll be a counter-puncher, like Mr. Mayer, and say: no, let's not do research; let's do something, and if it turns out to be good, everybody will recognize it like everybody can recognize an educated man.

But to be more serious, sure, we have to do research and we have to do research particularly, as Mr. Deutsch says on what produces the results that come out of a program. It's a little bit discouraging and distressing to see money poured down what is apparently drains. It's apparently a characteristic of our society that we prefer this kind of massive splattering approach when we hit a problem. We train too many infantrymen and we put them in school and we take them out, and so on. We waste an awful lot of motion, but at the same time, we do a great deal of improvisation, innovation, and if we can somehow capture the lessons of that improvisation and innovation, I am sure that would be extremely worthwhile.

Finally, on the question of the climate of teaching and on the characteristics of teachers. I am afraid our teachers are very much like we are. Perhaps what we should do as leaders of a very prestigeful occupation is to demand that the rest of society conform to us and fix it so that they do, either by giving them adequate preparation to conform to our expectations or putting the screws on until they do.

ADDITIONAL QUERIES AND COMMENTS

John Powell: There are two or three points in Peter's paper which I am frankly puzzled to know what he means, and I wonder if he would extend me the privilege of pointing out a couple of those for clarification. A minor one is on page 6, and perhaps my sociology is well out of date. The sentence is: "Bureaucratization of large scale enterprises has cut down on the opportunity of individuals to hand on their advantages directly to their descendants." Do you mean bureaucratization or automation?

Peter Rossi: Bureaucratization.

Powell: Executives tended to remain executives.

Rossi: Yes, but they can't hand on their position to their dull-witted sons, their specific position.

POWELL: I thought that was still being done, but I was not clear. Let me take a more important one.

ROSSI: O.K. Maybe they are. I haven't met any dull-witted sons of bureaucrats. On the East Coast they may be more decadent.

POWELL: There is a more important complex of confusion in my mind between pages 21, 22 and 23. Let me start with 22: "The characteristics of a successful program of intervention.....are first it must be capable of being employed on a wide enough scale to affect significant proportions of lower-class children. . .should be capable of being staffed by the same caliber of persons who run our public school systems and by lesser skilled individuals. . .and must not be beyond our financial capabilities." Then you say: thus we see that's it's unlikely that we can do it at all. This confused me a little bit, particularly since on page 23 you say we need to invent new occupations for displaced persons. And on page 21, in talking about residential centers, you suggest that, "The bottom layers of the staff". . . should come from. . ."persons recruited from the same population as the childred" and properly trained.

Do those really fit together, that you could draw from the underprivileged groups persons who could be trained to go back into them and carry on this enrichment and they would have to be done on a significantly large scale, but since we don't have enough money to do it, we won't be able to? I am lost.

ROSSI: Yes, so am I, I have to admit. I am expressing their Utopian aspirations and in part some realistic cynical pessimism. That is to say, if we really take this pre-school treatment very, very seriously, that's going to be quite expensive. I am not quite sure whether our society is ready to pay that price at this moment or perhaps would prefer to fiddle around with the curriculum, rather than create new institutions for the processing of pre-school kids.

On the second point of the retraining of lower-class individuals to socialize themselves, I don't think we have paid very much attention to this possibility. For example, talking with Urie Bronfenbrenner at lunch today, the Soviet system of extensive child care and some of its side effects, I said, "What about the possibility of supervised motherhood; that is to say, that we intervene directly in the family and have the parents do the socialization in the proper fashion, bringing the mothers into a nursery school situation, for example, or very early childhood and just training them. You do this; you do that, and here is how you answer questions, if that's the technique."

I don't know what the specific techniques are. Those are not my particular area. But we can certainly, it seems to me, think about the utilization of much lower l levels of skill than we presently employ.

Apparently, to listen to this morning's discussion, it doesn't take very much level of skill to be a school teacher, and as we go down a few notches we will decrease the quality much further.

On the third point of the invention of new sorts of occupations, I wasn't suggesting here who precisely would invent this. But it seems to me that we are moving in a direction in our society of inventing different organizational forms for all sorts of services which households at one time performed for themselves. Maybe we ought to wave a little cash in their faces in the form of some sort of subsidized wages for staff in order to get such a thing underway.

Seymour Harris: Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a few economic issues, if you don't mind. I have been saving these up from this morning, too, because the same issues have been raised.

You, for example, Mr. Chairman, suggested that the teachers are going to ask for a good many billion dollars, and that was a fine revolution. And this morning Mr. Schaefer said that we ought to get some more cash but there is the problem of the real estate. I am not sure we need many more billions of dollars for the teachers. Actually, as somebody said this morning, I think the public school teacher's income has done about as well as the average of the nation over the last recent years. They have re-established their position. This is not true of college professors, who are down about 40%, it seems to me, from the rest of the working population. That's where the pressure should be put for getting incomes up.

Since I am ready to retire, I am not speaking for myself. Now, I think there is a lot of nonsense about the real estate business. There isn't any more money in real estate--actually, if you look at history of public finance in the last fifteen years, take the 1950's, you'd find that the total income of state and local governments went up 50 billion dollars. The largest part of that came out of real estate taxes. Don't forget, we have 20 million new houses and many cities have re-assessed their property, so that even if we don't get any money from the Federal Government--I don't think you are going to get much money from the Federal Government-- you may get an awful lot from state and local governments, if they really want to pay the bill.

There is, of course, something to be said for higher pay, because we are working with a thin generation of teachers, in terms of population, and we have these large numbers of young people, and from that point of view you do have to perhaps get more cash if you want teachers of quality.

Now, one point was raised this morning about merit increases. If we could have a more effective use of the money we have, we wouldn't need very much more money. I know merit increases are out, as was said this morning, but for example what about the general idea that when you need mathematics teachers, why don't you pay them more against other teachers? Of course, the AFofL doesn't like this idea. They say if you want to pay a mathematics teachers a thousand dollars more, pay everybody a thousand dollars more and then you can get more mathematicians and everybody else profits from this.

But that means a most ineffective use of your cash.

Somebody mentioned team teaching. I think this is a very effective way of getting some differentiation and making more effective use of your good teachers.

There's one thing that some people don't realize, and that is that the teachers, just like the hospitals, are up against a tough problem and that problem is that there is a great rise in productivity year after year in the economy, which is reflected in rising incomes, which means the educational plant or the educational machinery has to pay the costs of these higher incomes but doesn't get the compensation and increased productivity that these other parts of the economy do. This makes it much more difficult for the educational interests to keep maintaining their position.

I think what was said about the changing pattern of spending, if you get this kind of help at all, will be very helpful. But to spend that 10 or 15 billion dollars, which seems to me about the minimum that we require to bring that about, to raise the poverty groups into, say, a minimum level, this doesn't look as though it's coming.

What's more important, it's going to be very difficult to get any kind of help from the Federal Government, because we now have a program of tax cuts as a way of stimulating the economy. This has a much greater universal appeal, especially among businessmen who are influential, and especially Mr. Johnson. As long as Mr. Johnson is afraid to spend money and as long as the military expenditures keep on at their present level--and not likely to go down very much in the near future--you are not going to be able to get this money for education or any other welfare service in the amounts that are needed and that many of you would like to see become available.

Oscar Cohen: I would suggest that we are not going to solve most of the problems that have been posed here without massive Federal Aid, and I don't subscribe to the theory that we are not going to get Federal money or that society is not ready to spend the money that is necessary on education. I don't think society will be ready as long as we take the kind of attitude that Mr. Harris has taken, especially with the kind of "Milltown" he slipped us last night about the unemployment rate.

I'd like to refer to Mr. Trow's comments on equality of opportunity and add a dimension. He indicated that there was a difference between a weak and a strong position on equality within a school system and the theory of compensatory education is being increasingly accepted. The New York School System is one in which the Principle has been accepted. Now I would suggest that there might be a theory of compensatory education as between school systems.

Mt. Vernon spends $850 per student, New York $900, New Rochelle $1,000, but St. Louis spends $350. This is a great differential.

Whether these figures are exact or not, I think we will accept the fact that there is a very substantial difference in the financial resources that are made available to the educational systems in various cities. Are we satisfied with this situation and should there not be an effort to reduce tax expenses if we are to achieve equality of opportunity not only within each system but between systems?

Herman Long: Mr. Chairman, I think this discussion this afternoon leads us a step farther than we have been, if I make the right deductions.

I think Mr. Rossi is saying in effect that the basic way to change all of this and to provide equality of opportunity is to eliminate the lower class and all that this means. Without considering how this mammoth task gets to be undertaken, it certainly leads to the next set of considerations and that is lower class in the United States today almost is synonymous with Negro. How do you abstract the element of race from the context of class? Race is a chronic element in the persistence, of concentration of Negros in the lower class.

If one asks this question, then we are led to ask: how do you deal with the peculiar and chronic and difficult element of race in providing broader economic equality of educational oppportunity?

Well, you say we do it like we are beginning to do it already. We begin by desegregating the school systems. Well, how are we desegregating the school systems? Then we are thrown back on the various devices that we are involved in now--bussing, special aids, and whatnot. Then because we aren't satisfied with these special approaches to the racial aspect, we are driven to the sets of questions which are raised by the first discussant.

I am not sure that these questions that you raise, however, are the crucial questions for research, if they are to advance our efforts to intervene any farther. And I am not sure whether research into whether different combinations of proportions of lower-class or Negro children under varying conditions of arrangements within classes, or shcools, or tracks, or societies, or under different types of teaching, or under different types of teaching methods, or a different type of teaching approach, is going to advance us much farther. Martin Deutsch's observations seem promising; he is suggesting we turn our direction away from results--this means quantitative measurements of achievement as such--into what happens in the process, because we may stand to learn much more that way. I am more excited therefore by this kind of departure.

Rossi: It would seem to me that nothing that either on of us has said today would of any avail if there were no place in American society for Negroes above age 16. That's a problem which, at least as I wrote my paper, I pushed aside and said: look, the problem of legislating and enforcing equality of opportunity for employment and residence and the like, that's a separate problem; it's a massive problem, but it's one which has to be solved and needs intensive thinking-through of its own.

All we can do right now is to employ our old-fashioned legal mechanisms to make sure that at least we get some conformity behavior under some circumstances, where we can catch the criminal.

But certainly I think what we are addressing ourselves here to now is: how do we prepare a new generation of Negro and other lower-class children to meet the opportunities which we hope are going to be available to them ten, twenty, thirty years from now?

Nothing is much more disappointing than the numerous indidents which I have heard of, Civil Rights Commission after Civil Rights Commission arguing desperately with department stores and other firms and saying: will you please hire a Negro? And they say, finally, yes, and then they can't find one. It seems to me that's the situation we don't want to be in ten or twenty years from now.

Long: Of course, that's not the answer.

Mr. Rossi stated that we ought to take it upon ourselves, by interventions and whatever legal apparatus we have, to make lower-class kids middle-class; he argued that they don't like themselves and we don't like them. The evidence for that, I guess, is undebatable.

Nevertheless, I completely disagree with the conclusion, because I think it ignores the fact that the self-hatred is a result of what our being what we are makes of what they are. It isn't, I think, so much a matter of avoiding romanticizing the poor that is the danger. It's more a matter that I cannot, after 43 years of life, romanticize the American middle-class at all, whatsoever.

But we forget, I think, that we are making all of these suggestions--though Mr. Rossi didn't forget it, within the context of compulsion. We are suggesting, with the interventions and with the use of Ben Bloom's good results and justifying the interventions at an increasingly low age, that there is to be no alternative to growth through the American middle-class patern and as that is exhibited in the schools and through the kinds of behaviors that Mr. Deutsch mentioned as occuring when more humane techniques are made available to teachers.

I want to suggest, however, that for certain kinds of real humanization, high schools,-and to a lesser degree but still to some extent, elementary schools, are awful places. The awfulness is related precisely to the middle-class characteristics--though that's an over-general term--that we say characterize what we would now want to be the only path to self-realization or economic success.

This is very much related to the question of bureaucratization and of an open society. One of the crowning things that makes our bureaucracies behave as they do and become oppressive, as they do, is their constant need for caution, what I might call the Jules Feiffer effect, the fact that your status never is settled. I think we should be aware that we are making some strong recommendations for not merely the supplanting of a certain kind of character structure which can only be defended by romanticizing it but for supplanting it by another that I don't think can be defended, even by romanticizing it. We are also proposing to extend the use of legal apparatus and compulsion in order to do it through what seems to be quite a massive process of anticipated intervention.

Rossi: It seems to me that before you can run, you have to learn how to walk; and before you can transcend the middle-class you have to go through it, and maybe there is some ticky-tacky which will stick to you on your journey through this bubble gum that is America, but certainly we have to go through the bubble gum in order at least to have some of the flavor adhere to us.

I am going to say something to you in terms of this wishfulness of nice orderly research goal-setting and priority-establishment in terms of the extraordinarily unrealistic image that you have of the nature of the Negro revolution.

All of you have contacted Baldwin and perhaps written him off as a vinegared-perfumed variety of his race. Let me say to you that the nature of Negro anger in the eyes of little children and adolescents as well as their parents is such that we are on the brink of degrees of violence in the streets of the city, which last summer's eruptive propositions in the slums was a mild, mild forecast. And to assume under those circumstances, Marty (Deutsch), that your research will be kept captive and released in such exactly statistically-determined increments for application is to live in an illusion of the nature of the revolution that we face.

You complained to me a year ago that material that you were most unwilling, because of its tentativeness to introduceinto your carefully-conditioned nursery schools was being purloined and put into use by practitioners who had no concept of its basis nor any philosophic understanding of why it came to be. And I am saying to you that this is going to happen, that in times of revolution the one ingredient that is perpetually missing is time.

And I am also saying that this lovely and essentially academic structuring of a four-scale intervention procedure is not going to take place in a nice orderly pedantic one, two, three, four order of priorities. All of these things are going to be massively attempted, and some of them are going to produce some massive failures.

We are living in a temporary peacetime. We seem to have quickly forgotten the nature of the riots of last summer, and I am anticipating that come warm weather this spring we will see warfare in our streets and eruptiveness politically on the part of the Negro population and demands on education that are going to transcend nice orderly procedures. And we are going to see a pumping of billions of dollars, because the perpetual American answer to trouble is to spend money.

SESSION THREE

Theme: THE CHALLENGE OF INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

Introduction	**HENRY DYER**	**1 - iii**
Theme Paper and Supplementary Comments	**SAMUEL A. KIRK**	**1 - 27 c**
Discussion	**FRITZ REDL**	**28 - 37**
Discussion	**MILTON SCHWEBEL**	**38 - 44**
Response	**SAMUEL A. KIRK**	**45 - 50**
Additional Queries and Responses		**51 - 55**

INTRODUCTION

by

Henry Dyer

I have five minutes to work off my tensions, especially after Martin Mayer's remarks last night about tests and the rage about tests and scientism and education. I could spend the whole five minutes defending myself against the methodology of measurement that Martin has created. It's the mythology of the evils of measurement as he sees it today, which is only not quite as bad as the mythology of the miracles of measurement that used to dominate the scene thirty years ago.

I was impressed last night with the discussion on the confusion about the definition of what was meant by equality in education, and was impressed by Sidney Hook's definition of equality in education being equality of concern. And it seems to me that equality of concern, as it relates to the problem that is being discussed tonight, means meeting the pupil where he is with what he has to offer and doing the best you can for him.

In other words, it means paying attention to individual differences. Now, there are two kinds of things that become barriers to paying adequate attention to individual differences. One set of difficulties has to do with the fact that teachers, administrators and others don't really understand individual differences, and this, I take it, arises from four kinds of superstitions.

One kind of superstition is the superstition that intelligence is genetically determined. As you talk to the people in the schools they still think that the I.Q. is unalterable, that there is nothing you can do about it, that the whole pattern of growth of the individual is determined at birth. If you have read Sam Kirk's paper you know he identifies three sources of differences: the genetic, the pre-natal, and the post-natal. I don't know if anybody has ever yet discovered how much of the variance in any particular characteristic can be traced to any one of these three, or how you partition the variance over these three.

But one thing we do know is that when you are faced with an individual student and you have to make up your mind where he stands in this multi-dimensional space of abilities, interests, and characteristics of various kinds, you don't know to what extent his position in this space is determined by his genes, by his pre-natal environment, and by his post-natal environment. It's impossible to disentangle this for the individual, and I think this is a point that is not always recognized even by people who are trying to be intelligent about this.

A second kind of superstition is that intelligence is unidimensional. We still talk very glibly about the I.Q. as though it meant something. We know that intelligence, human ability, human functioning is multi-dimensional. We haven't discovered all the dimensions yet, but we know in general terms that it is multidimensional and that it must be dealt with that way to be dealt with intelligently.

Then there is the current superstition which I think has been reinforced by work that has been quoted several times at this conference, namely, Benjamin Bloom's* book on the fact that the pattern of growth, the level of intelligence, the level of coping is set by the age of five, six, seven, eight. Bloom's data are very interesting. They are all correlational data, all based on the given, on what we have. They say nothing about the possibilities of intervention at a higher level where, let's say, at age ten, or fifteen, or even twenty, where you might be able to effect great changes, if you could find the techniques, if you really understood the dynamics of the way people develop and function.

I really get worried when I hear people quoting these findings so glibly, so complacently at this point. It's the same kind of complacency we had thirty years ago when we were resting on the notion that the I.Q. measured native intelligence.

There is a fourth superstition that Sam takes up in his paper and I imagine will cause considerable discussion. He believes that you can achieve remedial treatment by attention to symptoms; that you do not have to go into some kind of depth therapy in order to achieve correction, change, to bring a person into where he should be. I agree with him, but I think, however, that there may be many who won't.

There are other practical matters that interfere with the paying of attention to individual differences -- three, primarily. Even though we recognize the differences, even though we can measure them to some fairly accurate extent, we still don't know what to do about them. We are still arguing about ability grouping, homogeneous grouping of various kinds. Kirk's paper cites 35 different methods of coping with the problem of individual differences and yet none of them has been adequately tested. We don't know how they work, how well they would develop, how well they'd work in improving the academic achievement of students. We know even less about what their side-effects may be on students, the emotional effects, the social effects, and so on.

---

* Bloom, Benjamin, STABILITY AND CHANGE IN HUMAN CHARACTERISTICS, New York, Wiley & Sons, 1964.

The primary tactical problem, it seems to me, is that of course we know that we can bring about genuine correction, genuine remediation if we can spend the time, if we can get the experts on the job to do it. The problem is, we are not producing the experts. Instead, we are still looking for methods by which the classroom teacher can deal with the problems of individual differences.

Finally, there is a paradox in this situation. Whenever you talk about individual differences, you are talking about comparing people with one another, and comparisons are odious. This is part of the problem of the tension, the frustration, the thing that produces the difference in the class conflict, sociologically. Yet, unless we compare, we can't even highlight the individual differences that we must highlight if we are going to deal with them. This is the kind of paradox out of which I just don't know the way.

SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS
by
Samuel A. Kirk

I agree with Prof. Hook that equality of education is a moral question and implies equality of opportunity, not identity of school offerings. I think we have to differentiate between equality of abilities and equality of opportunity.

I mentioned in my paper that all children, with the exception of identical twins, are biologically unequal. But Rumford Bremer told me that was wrong, too, because there are some differences in identical twins in some aspects.

Martin Mayer raised the question whether Prof. Hook would give equal opportunity to a Rockefeller and a slum child. My point of view is yes, provided you started at age one. It would be different if we asked the question starting at age twenty. But I see no reason in this country why a child in the slums shouldn't have equal opportunity with a governor and everything that a Rockefeller would have because of the accident of birth. And if we are going to talk about equality of opportunity, we would have to talk about equality at a very early age and not at a later age.

All of us know that our children particularly have great advantages over the children in the slums primarily because of the accident of birth. My major thesis in this paper is that our mass selection and mass education techniques cause us to discriminate against individual children who do not fit the range we call average, even though it is a wide range. This has resulted in deviating approaches to the education of what might be considered a minority group, the deviating individual.

In the field of health we have established hospitals for the sick; we haven't established hospitals for the well. Those that require deviating attention, remediation, tutoring, counseling, or what have you, in the school are probably the so-called sick individuals in our school system, for which we have not provided in education as we have provided in health.

Dr. Taylor criticized our selection procedures in colleges and he was criticized for criticizing. But it is true that we have selection standards that are rather uniform for everybody, regardless of what area they are going in, and we are thereby making a great number of mistakes, rejecting a great number of students that could make a contribution in our society.

Possibly the best opportunity to develop intelligence of children is at a young age. I tried to say zero to three, and stated very specifically that it was a good guess, because I think it's very difficult to prove a point like that. Bloom says one to four, zero to four. I think there is some evidence that the lower down we go in the age scale, the better chance we have of improving this multi-dimensional intellectual function. This may also be controversial.

We have children with all kinds of disabilities and our tendency is to throw them out or let them drop out of school, not that they are defective in all areas, but defective in certain areas.

We have a tendency in school and in other areas to classify people. We have taxonomies. During the war we classified people into Grade 1, 2, 3 and 5. If they were in Grade 5 or Class 5, they all fit into the same mould, as if a classification for a group really fits the classification of an individual. But professionally we have seemed to be satisfied by labeling people with a name, so we call them dull, smart, average, neurotic, schizophrenic, or if we are not quite sure they are schizophrenic, we will call them pre-schizophrenic, so that if they don't become schizophrenic, we haven't made a mistake. But as long as we give a label, we seem to be satified, and this classification jargon seems to give us a great deal of satisfaction. Possibly it reduces the tension of professional ignorance by giving a label.

We think we have satisfied the professional requirements of our position by classification.

I think that if we are to talk about equality of education we will have to extend our schools to encompass all of these problems and not the ones that are easy. And the fact that some of these are very difficult and beyond the scope of our present methods of testing or our present methods of remediation does not allow us to throw the child out or go to something that's a little easier to do.

DISCUSSION
by
Fritz Redl

I'm listed on your menu as a sociologist from Wayne State University. Will you please tax-exempt my sociology department from having anything to do with me? I love them all, but I am not a sociologist; I'm not in the department, and don't pin me on them. They are innocent of anything I'm going to say from now on in.

If you ask me what I am, I have several identities -- I have an identity crisis in my old age. I'm an interdesciplinary alley-rat from way back, and at the moment I will talk today primarily in a combined role as clinician and educator, hopefully not totally unaware of some of the things we learned and stole from sociology and anthropology and these fields in the meantime.

However, you are lucky I'm not a sociologist because if I were, I now would give you hell. I would walk out of this room, because you are a no-good bunch of so-and-sos. What you do with the concept of the slum child is incredible. What are you constructing here?

There is a stereotype developing which you would not allow in your own discipline for five minutes. The slum child all of a sudden is a mixture between a mascot-stereotype and a scapegoat-stereotype. They are all the same; they are all ignorant, dumb, uninterested, aggressive, hostile, not even making a difference between active hostility and passively strong hostility, which is so clear and obvious in many of them, not complaining of those who are so docile that the fools don't even rebel against the mess they are in and even let this miserable teaching and impossible situation which they are put in happen, and even say thank you afterwards.

You talk only about the slum area child. What about the child of the upper upper classes? Don't you find as many nincompoops and dopes there? Don't you find some of these kids' aggression more intolerable, even though the Old Man pays for the car which the kid wrecked so the kid didn't end up in jail?

So I am really upset about the danger which we are in because as a result of the poverty jag we are on, suddenly we have to create new stereotypes because they are comfortable.

The problem, of course, of discussing a paper within a short time, especially of that many issues, is a big one. And, therefore, let me give you a menu; I will only pick a few things, and some of those which I wanted to pick you already took care of anyway, and that means I will talk about three happinesses, three concerns, and one indecent question.

Three happinesses about Sam's paper. Happiness No. 1: Happiness is if somebody puts his finger on implementational psychopathy in its worst form. And by implementational psychopathy I mean a state of our society in which we are terribly ambitious, that everybody is the finest and the best, but we don't give a damn whether there is enough of it to go around, whether there is enough of it to go around, whether there is enough of it in the area where it is needed most and/or whether whatever we say we are doing is really implemented, knowing what should go into it. Once we have a little bit of a flimsy project, we forget them and suddenly say we've got to be realistic and confuse prostitution with compromise, and all of a sudden we think we have this little project here, this little project there, so everything is fine and dandy, we already have the best in our country, we have the best.

We are an underdeveloped country in Education. The paper pushes in the direction of pointing this out. We already know we want equality of opportunity. We know what kind of disturbance we have. We even know something about the projects needed, what they should be like, the best ones, how many we need, where they should be; how many children are not even counted -- waiting lines that will never get in to them. Are we talking about that?

There are many points in Kirk's paper where this is stated, but he stops with the little ones and doesn't go beyond that because he could point out exactly the similar kind of thing with the older ones, where it gets worse and worse. It is also my impression that many of the things we say now we cannot change when children get older are identical with what we used to say, for instance, about some of the schizophrenics we previously thought could never be treated because nobody ever produced the situation where you can treat them.

You've got a set-up which is more than a "snake-pit." Then some of them become treatable, and you can't say it's untreatable just because we forget that we haven't got what we pretend we need and keep our mouth shut about it.

The second point is: Happiness is if somebody finally gets specific at last. In clinical jargon we have a way of talking about the emotionally-disturbed, which is about the most nonsensical term I ever heard in my life. When we get mad at the clinical guys, we say something like, after all, there are certain skills which have to be learned, there is a learning process, there are cognitive processes, and they are important too. And then we talk in general about cognitive processes until the kids are blue in the face, and we don't know what we are talking about any more.

Now Sam becomes much more specific, and while I don't necessarily buy all the details of what kind of subfunction you can analyze the cognitive processes in, which kids must be helped on, the mere fact that he begins to get very specific about it is one thing which makes me very happy, indeed.

You sometimes get specific in breaking down research concepts. That's fine and easy and dandy and important, but in the moment we talk about what we do with kids in the active situation we get very general and we get the community support for something globally, and then the people who are confronted with the multiplicity of behavior in one hour with a bunch of even five kids do not have a chance to really analyze in detail what the thinking disturbance looks like, what does the kid do, whatever it is, and this is a problem just as much in the clinical field as it is in the field of learning.

The third happiness is if somebody finally takes group compositions seriously, more so than just giving lip service to it. Now, Sam did it in part in a negative way by showing how all the stereotypes of what kind of groups can you make up if you make stereotyped declarations of what is disturbance, how that doesn't work, and there are 35 on his list, and it is obvious something more is needed.

The real question for somebody is not only how can we categorize groups of disturbances and say, here is the deaf, the blind, the emotionally disturbed, the schizophrenic, the this or that, but how can we then put live people together in a group that becomes a workable group -- and here he points in the direction. He has no chance to go into detail -- it would be a different paper -- but the challenge is quite obvious to me.

Here we are way behind because most of the concepts of a so-called homogeneous group are still rather primitive. What do you mean homogeneous, anyway? Is it homogeneous by the color of eyes, as heterogeneous as possible by the feet lengths or what; and the question is not, are they or aren't they. The question is, which type of mixture can I buy with how much deviation in it in a given group right now and still make a go of it? For that question we have far fewer answers. This is a very strong challenge which he didn't exploit more as he could have, had he had more time or space.

Group composition is essential and the question whether a given bunch of kids is workable or not has something to do with not how similar they are but in which areas can you afford to have the relatively less similar, in which areas do they have to be similar or else you can't, and in which areas can you have a wide range of differences and still make a go of it, provided the group is small enough, you are well enough implemented with enough material, space, teacher ability, and so forth, and that makes a hell of a difference. The same group can be workable under one set of conditions and not under others.

We tend to take for granted that we live in a mass education situation. You cannot do justice to quality and equality education if it remains mass education . That's already a contradictory adjective.

On the other hand, the alternative is not one tutor or governess for each child; the alternative is the kind of group composition that is workable, and we know more about it than we practice, but we still know less about it than we ought to.

Now about my three concerns. Number one: somewhere, not in what he says but in the illustrations he uses there is a faint odor of a dead horse -- beaten. And by that I mean somewhere behind what he says looms the idea that there is a discrepancy between psychiatry on the one hand, and cognitive learning and helping people with their actual skills, on the other. We are beyond that.

Many disturbances in learning are clearly exactly what you said -- disturbances in learning -- and we need to know much more about them. There is a place for remedial tutoring way beyond what we are using in this country, and by this I mean not only cognitive but many other things in it, and we are not making enough use of it.

A second concern I have about the paper is a question. Why hang onto some of the obsolete concepts,especially in the original distorted forms in which psychiatrists, clinicians and mental hygiene people popularized them? They, themselves, never believed them.

For instance, the concept of symptom. In some of the places you operate with a concept of symptom which I could buy; in some places something is smuggled in here which is a totally obsolete concept of a symptom. For instance, you make the point, is nailbiting a symptom? By the way, there are plenty of nail-biters in the room, I observed and, of course, as adults we have a wonderful way -- we just smoke cigars and we go like this, and finally we stand here or we chew up the pipe-stems. Why would you cure people of that? Just wait until they are allowed to smoke, that's all.

What can a poor kid do? He can't do anything if he needs to have some muscular machinery going because he's bored stiff or tense. What is more normal than that? Why call it a symptom? Or call it a symptom, and then let's raise the question, symptom of what?

Let's assume I have a kid in a big classroom, an exam, one of them finally gets mad for some reason, he takes his paper, crumples it up, throws it down, runs out, and slams the door. What's that a symptom of? Of course, it's symptomatic behavior. First of all, it may be a symptom that the kid hates my guts. Maybe it's a symptom that the kid has no chance to rebel against his father. The only chance he has to rebel is against a comfortable teacher who likes him anyway, so it won't be too dangerous. Maybe that's a symptom. Maybe it's a symptom that five kids gave him finger-signs and said something about his sister, and finally he had had it, and rather than have a temper tantrum for which he would be sent to the principal and paddled, he gets out.

Maybe it's a symptom of the fact that he is desparate and close to crying and he can't afford to cry -- the group code is against it -- so he better get out fast. Maybe he waited too long to go to the john and by now he better run out fast, and after he is out of the door the wind comes and slams the door. Maybe that's what the symptom is.

Let's raise the question, symptom of what? And let's not come around and say I cured throwing down papers and running out by simply teaching the kid how to walk in and out of the room. For some kids teaching him when to go to the john on time will be enough. For other kids that is not the answer. They need something else, and the two are entirely different cases. They have nothing in common except the chance factor that they picked the same behavior to solve whatever problem bothered them at the moment. There is only a coincidence of behavioral similarity which is directly dictated by the situation rather than by the kid's pathology or psychology, to begin with, and that's all they have in common.

Now we come around and suddenly say that's a symptom, let's treat the symptom. And now we pick any bunch of kids, and for some of them it will go away because that was all there was; for others it doesn't. And it doesn't prove anything about whether you can treat symptoms. You can treat symptoms, especially things which aren't even symptoms. And why should you declare that any disturbance in learning is a symptom of something else? Maybe it's a disturbance in learning. The child had the measles when they had long division or he was sick or he was in a stupor because his younger brother appeared on the scene and that's why he can't go back to that. That may be all there is to it. Or by now, however, he doesn't know it because five years had passed so, in the meantime, he'd better get some good instruction, plus an amenable situation in a small group in which he isn't threatened, where the teacher doesn't produce other forms of rivals so the old trauma is revived. It's duck soup. That kid is going to learn long division in a hurry. What's wrong with that? That means teaching with a lot of other stuff in it. No psychiatrist will claim that this kid needs anything but. There is no either/or business, that we either treat the symptoms or we treat the cause, for the cause is always the emotional disturbance. It's way overdrawn. It isn't as simple as that. It's much more complex.

The third concern I have is for the traces of disrespect toward clinical complexity which shows up in three forms. One is that in some of the case histories which you have in there, which are called case histories, which look a little bit flat-chested to me, in some of those case histories, there is no concern about subsurface effect and side effect. In any area, including drug therapy, we know how risky that business is and how something may disappear right now unless we really know and check what else happened and what else was in it to begin with. Let's not be so clear that this was all that was needed. And there is, at least in the material presented, in my opinion, not enough evidence that subsurface effects or side effects were actually taken enough into account outside the direct cognitive effect which you obviously have.

Then the second way it shows is that I think we forget sometimes that one given kid does not have to be obedient to our textbook categories. The kids are nasty. They don't read our books and then obey them, and they allow themselves to accumulate disease entities which should not be together in one package. This is too bad. Sam referred to it very beautifully when he mentioned how angry we get if children produce behavior symptoms which don't belong together. Either you have a neurotic or you have an actor-outer; you can't be both.

I have a classroom for acter-outers and one for neurotics and then that fool kid comes around and has both. It's not fair. On top of it, which is worse -- and I'm now talking from the nightmare of the clinician -- if you get the kid into the psychiatric unit, they send me a kid with a diagnosis which is beautiful. The diagnosis fits the situation very well, except they don't mention some of the other stuff that's in the kid, which is more relevant to the guy who is supposed to teach him five minutes later. And if I am the attendant, the nurse or the teacher of that kid, the thing I want to know is whether he was or wasn't born with or without instruments -- by now he is twelve years old -- what I want to know first is, is that kid simply happy having his pathology, or is he a skillful manipulator who will have everybody in on the act in five minutes? That makes a hell of a difference.

For instance, I want to know who can go in the same cottage. Where is it, in the case history? It's neither in the educational one nor is it in the clinical one.

So somewhere along the line we forget that no matter how nicely we classify the different disturbances -- with some of the physical syndromes we can sort of make exaggerations, because once you are blind, this one part is so obviously relevant that no matter what else there is, you still have clearly this one to deal with. And then you'd better also come to grips with the rest of it. But in the psychological field it isn't as clean and as clear, so the problem is, really, we sometimes get the same kid who fits into a larger number of classifications, and yet we have to have that one kid as one person in a group with others, and that, by the way, makes the grouping which you referred to so complicated and so difficult and where any one of those 35 listed, nice and neat administrative devices or grouping are obviously not good, because the kids collect more than one disease.

In the physical sciences we are not surprised about it any more. It's perfectly legal to have a sore foot, heart disease, and need an appendix out. But you can't now say this is too bad, you are either an appendix guy or a foot disease guy. I'm sorry, I'm both, and then the teacher has to deal with that package and not with the description of the disease, and that's what we forget, the guy in the trenches every day, that's what he is stuck with.

In the ward, for instance, you run into that all the time. In one day of the children carefully selected because of a pre-psychotic -- your description is beautiful. If you say "pre," we can't go wrong. If it is psychotic, we say -- well, we put "pre". If he isn't psychotic, well, we only said "pre", so it's all right. And that's why we constantly talk about borderline cases. In any psychiatric discussion you hear more about borderline cases than cases, because borderline is safe, and nobody can pin it on you.

It's not just the nastiness of people, it's a real problem. There is a real issue. It isn't only that we are too convenient -- avoiding the names wouldn't solve the problem. It's more complex than that.

For instance, one of the same kids one day within three hours may have three entirely different temper tantrums. The first one is a genuine outburst of the pathology for which he was sent. All of a sudden some irrational thing hits him, and he blows his top. Nobody knows what happens. The next one looks like it, so everybody sets down another evidence that he is this pre-psychotic kid.

If I look closer, that's not it at all. What happened is the kid was engaged in interaction with other kids; somehow something went wrong, somebody got him so mad he couldn't help himself. Anybody else would, at that moment, have seen red and sailed into the other guy. On top of it, the other guy was stronger, so a melee developed, and by now the kid was either scared to death or mad, and then throws another temper tantrum. If you do that much to people, I hope they would have temper tantrums. If you guys would throw temper tantrums, the communities would wake up faster to what's really needed. So there's nothing pathological about it, but it's the same kid.

What a temptation for my staff to run around with their charts and say: three incidents of this pathological temper tantrum -- only one was one. The other was merely a legitimate accident of the combination of environmental factors, unbearable stimuli and, admittedly, a certain susceptibility to blow-offs when things get beyond a certain point that this kid can bear, which is a little bit lower than other people's threshold of what they can bear.

So somewhere along the line I think we forget in many of the classifications that in reality, for the teacher, it isn't so neat, and for the superintendent and principal it isn't so neat, either because we may theoretically talk and separate the people with the different syndromes and discuss them in a clinic, but when you've got them in one room any one of them may have an odd mixture of them, and our real problem is, how do we smell out which mixture is coming with the package, even though the official label doesn't even know about it? That's really what we ought to go after. We know very little about it, and that's what I think Sam has in mind.

There is a third and last thing which bothers me. We go around and select a group of children, pick up a symptom with no reference to what else may be in it, and then hit the symptom before we check whether that's all there is to it, or before we check what else might happen if we now treat the symptom in a peculiar and rather drastic way just because it's a symptom.

Now, I still believe that you can handle some symptoms. I do not dispute your evidence that some of the kids stop biting their nails. What I would like to know before I do something as dramatic as that is what is the symptom for? Is it only that kind of symptom? What else is in it? What is the potential reaction that we anticipate of the kid to that kind of medication? We don't just chuck drugs down people's throats, or at least we shouldn't. We've got to know what the stomach does with it when it gets in there, whether it directs it in the right direction or not.

And if I now bring a manicurist in and file people's nails, I would like to know for which kids does this experience mean what. Then I don't mind if you select a few and fix them up by fixing up their fingernails. I am sure you can do this, because some of them are not nail-biters. They are simply doing what they are not allowed to do, but later on we find other forms of doing it. It wasn't necessarily a serious symptom, to begin with.

So what bothers me is that just because we are not symptom-minded we thin k we can throw out the whole caboodle of clinical stuff as though it was just some fancy foolishness which Freud and some of the others dreamed up overnight. It isn't as simple as that, not any more, not in 1964. In 1964 even if I want a clean symptomatic treatment, I would like to know who it is whom I expose to it, in order to know what else is likely to happen; at least I want to take a calculated chance of figuring it out. I may still go ahead and try it and then stop if I see it doesn't work, just as in physical medicine sometimes you have to try something because you couldn't have known before, but you certainly want to look in that direction.

In a way I was bothered with the complacency with which this was described as beautiful evidence in most cases, except for the one kid who started biting his hand, which you ought to have known long before. If you show me that kid who later bites his hand, I could have told you right away: don't start filing his nails because, other things show what else is wrong with him. With that kid, the nail wasn't the only thing. Such a symptom doesn't float in midair. It's always imbedded in a much wider range of things which we can sniff out, and this is what I meant by saying that many behaviors, especially in learning, could well be taken care of by specific attention to the learning problem, but I want to have enough clinical caution surrounding it. Never mind the clinical boys, let's treat symptoms because symptoms are it to begin with.

We all are concerned with the raising of IQ's. Some of you think they can't be raised, some of you say maybe 30 points, and some of you say up to four years provided you do nothing, and you might say even older, provided you do something -- except we don't do it. And this is fine, I agree with all of that. But now I am raising the question, why are you so bothered with the whole IQ to begin with?

First of all, IQ is not identical with intelligence. And, second, why should everybody's IQ be raised right before automation? Is it really so that the kind of IQ you can produce by raising it a few points in those kids who are by now totally uninterested makes so much difference? Or maybe other properties are more important? They may have to operate in jobs which are boring and lonely, with nobody else around because somebody else takes care of the fancy machine, and maybe what they really need is the character strength not to get mad or desparate or lonely there or not to get furious at the machine or to have enough stick-to-it-iveness to stick it out for long periods of time.

Sam talks about the kids whose IQ's need to be raised. The only quarrel I have with this is that I find the limelight so heavily focussed on a little raising of a few IQ's, while other issues just as relevant for the function of the child in society and for society in a period of change are also equally important, and some of them are also part of learning, or at least they can only develop while learning is going on.

You can't teach a kid, for instance, there are some kids who cannot deserve. One of my biggest problems with some of the kids is that they cannot deserve, and the ability to deserve is not listed in any psychiatric list, and it's one of the greatest diseases I find in some kids.

By being unable to deserve I mean this. You make a deal with the kid. If he will keep the library all right, he gets 15 cents at the end of the week. The end of the week comes, he didn't touch the library, and he hates your guts now because he doesn't get the 15 cents. Now, in that case this kid cannot deserve.

Or another kid cannot deserve because if he really gets the 15 cents, it would mean nothing to him unless he can brag and say, I only got it by luck. I am a charmer, and because I'm so lucky, I'm only a gambler and only what I get by gambling is fine, so I constantly have to say around how dopey those professors are. He gave me that, even though I didn't deserve it, but I'm happy because I got it by luck.

Now, this is a serious affliction. This is probably a more serious disease than some schizophrenias, or at least equally serious. It isn't even in the psychiatric books and that couldn't be in the psychiatric books because it isn't seen except in the process of educating the youngster, in learning, and in group living. And here is a point where some of your challenges become especially strong and what you say about the need for specific attention to the learning process needs to expand, as you suggest in your paper, but have no time to go into detail. For instance, also about some of the learning that goes along with characterological deficiency and emotional disturbances. Just because it's an emotional problem doesn't mean it's originally a psychiatric problem. It may be an emotional problem overlaid over something that went wrong in the learning or the working process. Because learning doesn't only mean learning, it also means achieving within a group a standard with an adult, and if something goes wrong in that, you get as serious a trauma as if the parents had you in bed while they had intercourse. It's about as bad as that. And it's not the only way to traumatize a child. If you want to traumatize children, I can give you plenty of advice, and some of it can be done right in the learning situation. If you want to avoid it, you need to look to the learning, but with a jaundiced eye, not only with the cognitive process in mind, but with those other characteristics which also belong to the group learning process also in mind. That's why I would like to widen some of the material you describe which I know you have in mind, because you listed those things in terms of the emotionally-disturbed. But, obviously, in one big fell swoop you can only handle that much.

DISCUSSION
by
Milton Schwebel

My chief criticism, the major criticism, really, of Dr. Kirk's paper is that he actually embarasses us with the riches, providing really much too much stimulus material to select and deal with.

My differences probably are greater with Fritz than they are with Sam. The directive was that in our discussion of individual differences we should talk about those cases that, in a sense, were pathological, those cases for which ultimately treatment or prevention were necessary.

Very often a writer or specialist dealing with such a topic would immediately deal with it on a clinical level. But Sam has very cleverly avoided this. He has dealt with it much more profoundly in terms of theory and knowledge available about determinants, about origins. Sometimes such material is presented largely in terms of treatment or remediation. But Sam has dealt with it also in terms of prevention. And when he came to talk about remediation and treatment, he was not a prisoner of some of the psycho-dynamic theories or an over-emphasis on psycho-dynamic theory. And I believe, contrary to Fritz's point of view, that the large numbers of clinicians, clinical psychologists, and others still are prisoners of psycho-dynamic theory, and as a result both our practice and our research is sorely limited.

The thrust of our topic tonight and certainly of my paper is to consider this question: To what extent are individual differences of a pathological nature preventable and remediable? Because to the extent that they are, then to that extent the quality of our children is at a different level than we currently see it. And to the extent that our conceptions about the quality of learning ability are different from the way we perceive them now, to that extent questions about equality and handling problems of equality would be extremely significantly different.

I'd like to start by considering the special position that individual differences hold in our society, in our various professional groups, in education, in psychology, and I would say it holds the sacred position that motherhood holds; that, of course, individual differences are so sacred that one may never question them. It must always be invoked in any meeting and any time one considers educational planning, curriculum, selection, admissions, call it what you will, one must always think in terms of individual differences. And the claim is made, of course, that in a democracy this is essential, that really one is quite undemocratic unless the differences amongst individuals are recognized. True enough, but I should like to submit that this concept of individual differences has been a great weapon, used certainly not with malice, but a great weapon to inhibit the finest possible practices in democracy; that has been one of the chief instruments to prevent us from having the kind of quality and equality, both, but since I am commenting particularly on quality, that it has been one of the chief blocks, frustrating our reaching and achieving the kind of quality in education that might be possible.

I'd like to speak briefly about what I would consider the social historical role of the concept of individual differences; that is, exactly how it fits in, what purposes it serves socially and historically. All the differentiation that occurred before the emergence of man occurred as a law of nature, uncontrolled by any of the species. But when man appeared on the earth, then the differentiation could occur because man was able to move back from nature, step back from nature, observe it, master its laws, and thus begin to control himself and nature.

And in the process of his developing consciousness, he was able to speed up so tremendously the process of differentiation which is a characteristic of our social life.

Now, two aspects of this. One of them allowed the development of early forms of society. Different human beings began to assume different roles and very likely these different roles gave rise to different qualities of intellectual capacity, different specialties, perhaps; but more important is that in the process of developing control over the differentiations in man and in nature, one control that was achieved was that over the development of consciousness; that is, certain groups, certain individuals, again without malice, acting as if this were a way of nature, began to control the developing consciousness of other men, to inhibit the development of consciousness of men, to frustrate it, because those were the roles that they needed to play in society.

I have had occasion to examine some of the theories about learning ability over the centuries, and it was interesting to see how the theories change at various times in history. It was only during periods of social change that discussions of this kind could take place, that the philosophers and the scientists would declare that perhaps someone more than the kings and the emperors and the leaders really had the capacity to learn.

This is best illustrated by a statement of the King of Prussia in 1854, and I am stating this to you because I believe that what is represented in the views of the King of Prussia in 1854 were stated, expressed, implemented in social life for centuries before and still until this moment. He said: "The primary schools have only to work to the end that the common people may grasp and appreciate the Christian faith, may be intelligent in regard to all matters within the narrow sphere to which God has called them, may learn to read and write, record and sing, may love their rulers and their fatherland, be contented with their social status and live peaceful and happy in their life. I do not think the principles enunciated will raise the common people out of the sphere designated for them by God and society."

Science became involved in this and as did psychology, educators, and philosophy. Their role was to help carry out and rationalize the needs and wishes of the kings of Prussia and their predecessors and their successors.

If we were to trace hurriedly the role of the psychologists in America, for example, the very positive role that Thorndike played, and as Donald Snague, one psychologist pointed out, first came general education for the masses in America, then came Thorndike in educational psychology. But then came the period, of course, of the interpretations made during the First World War about the limited abilities of various races and ethnic groups and its use in ending or terminating immigration on a large scale, etc. And then came the depression and the Iowa Studies, including the Skiel Study, etc., and then came, during much of this period, a hiatus in our work in educational psychology, which, as Hilgard said as recently as about five or six years ago in his classic book on theories of learning, that even now, after half a century of work, there is not a single law of learning which can be applied in the classroom without serious reservations.

Now, with all of this I surely do not mean to suggest that nature has so ordained that all of us are equivalent, all of us are identical. This would be a very boring kind of world. I think even us men here would be quite dissatisfied if all women were constructed like Audrey Hepburn or even Anita Eckberg, and I think that we might seriously question whether we want all minds to fit in the mold of an Einstein or a George Bernard Shaw. But the question is: Which individual differences are susceptible to change, are not ordained by nature, are not desirable. Or, to put it in other terms, which individual differences are due to the inhibition of curiosity; in other words, which are due to inhibition of curiosity and the inhibition of learning, not maliciously planned, but so organized in our society?

Sam has given us some approaches to prevention. I would say the thesis, which is closely geared to his notions about prevention, really are represented by what I would call his open-ended interpretation of intellectual ability, wherein he says, in effect, that there is much we don't know about the capacity of man. He points first to the various factors or determinants responsible for the shaping of our intellectual capacities insofar as we know, but he says we don't know what the limits are.

I would disagree with Sam, however, on this one point. I think that it's not open enough. He falls victim to something that others have fallen victim to, and in quoting Benjamin Bloom to the effect that we problably are quite limited in the period up until age six or seven or eight. I would like to suggest a parallel between this current interpretation now and the interpretations that were current 30, 40 and 50 years ago, namely, with this emphasis on heredity. I believe it's serving the same purpose. After giving the conclusions of the studies on stability and intelligence particularly, Bloom says:

> "All this is merely an attempt to alert the reader to the view that our picture of stability and change and measured intelligence is one based on things as they are now, and this includes the particular test to help measure intelligence, the child-rearing practices of families in Western culture and educational practices in the schools. It is conceivable that changes in any or all of these could produce a very different picture than the one we have been able to draw."

In other words, his findings are based on current practices, on current knowledge, and the fact is, all we have to do is to look to several studies, including some studies in New York City with high school children, to see evidence of significant change occurring in IQ scores. And, Fritz, yes, I think raising the IQ is important. I think it's important in the lives of individuals insofar as the IQ is simply a reflection of current mental intellectual functioning level, which means an understanding about oneself, one's life, and the ability to use oneself and not feel frustrated -- to that extent at least.

There are other evidences as well. For example, an article about the chemical and anatomical plasticity of rats' brains, the point that Bennett, Diamond, Kretch, and Rosensweig make is that stimulation in young rats was significant in bringing about chemical and weight changes in the brain of the rat.

Now, these scientists point out that they don't know what this means for the functioning of the brain of the rat, just that the brain of the rat, the cortex in the brain of the rat was considerably significantly increased in size. Now, to this extent, of course, it seems to be quite related to the report of Benjamin Bloom. But they go further and say, what would happen if we provided stimulation for the adult rat?

They took a group of adult rats and they found, to their surprise, that the changes were equally significant, the changes in the biochemistry of the brain and the size of the brain.

Now, please don't misunderstand, I don't mean to suggest that there is any conclusive evidence that changes after the age of six are highly significant changes, nor do I mean to suggest that this is the direction we should take. But I would like to point out, consistent with our knowledge of the past use of concept of individual differences, that the likelihood that we will introduce on a large scale pre-nursery school training in the next ten years, the likelihood that we will provide millions and millions of children with this at this moment seems rather slight. Perhaps they will, but it's much less likely than the fact that we do have elementary schools for all children, and we do have high schools for all children. We still don't have kindergartens for all and we still don't have nursery schools for all who need it. The chances that we will provide them for 30, 40, I don't know how many millions in the next ten years seem very slim.

Therefore, to put all our eggs in the basket of pre-nursery school education is, it seems to me, an avoidance and a denial of the issue, and it would be consistent with past practices.

Now, I think, too, I would want more open-endedness in still another direction. We speak about open-endedness in terms of changing things in the pre-nursery school. If we do that, at least let us recognize that we need to make changes in the pre-natal period as well. And if we are thinking of the deprived children of today, then let's recognize this fact: in American 8 percent of the children are born prematurely. In the Bedford Stuyvesant area of Brooklyn, 20 percent of the Negro children are born prematurely. For those of you who are not acquainted with the fact, premature birth is associated with the gross and minor cerebral damage which is associated with problems, to various degrees of seriousness, in reading, speech, behavior disorders, you name the learning problem. It's much more likely to be associated with premature birth than not. And those who are working on it, particularly the group that was, and some that still are at Johns Hopkins, some of them are hypothesizing and believe they have some evidence to suggest that all children born prematurely can be assumed to have at least that minor cerebral damage which we cannot detect except post facto, when we begin to find learning problems of one kind or another.

To turn now to matters of remediation. I would strongly endorse Sam's point of view about the importance of the psycho-educational specialist, the emphasis on improved methods of diagnosis. Perhaps I misunderstood Fred, because he turned to Sam and said, "You are turning out very few." I think we are turning out large numbers of clinical psychologists whose orientation is largely psycho-dynamic. We are turning out many school counselors -- I am connected with that field in the training of such people -- many school counselors, guidance counselors, counselors for the college level, who, as Johnny-come-latelies, are just now becoming influenced by psychoanalytical theory, because these are the lower status professions and they have come to them now, at the very time when really the concentration must be, not a denial of the psycho-dynamic aspect, but the biological and the sociological. Of course, there is an increase now, partially as a result of the NDEA programs and the poverty program.

I think it would be unrealistic to expect that we can constitute new professions as we would like them, but we think we have an alternative, and the alternative is to change the nature of the current professions, and some of us are doing this in counseling and counseling psychology, and some are doing it in clinical psychology. If we can't form new professions, difficult as it is to start the institutionalization process, what we can do is change the nature and the training program. I've seen how it is possible to change, to destroy, to demolish the stereotypes that are current. I don't think it's necessary that people must come out of the slums in order to work with slum children. I think it's possible for people and stereotypes to be altered.

In other words, I think it's possible to educate people. But I would strongly endorse Sam's point of view about the expert diagnostician, first in all fields, trained and knowledgeable in the diverse causes of learning problems, and the associated problems of human adaptation that are connected with learning problems, the importance of this, and eliminating the theories that have made specialists impotent in the schools.

Finally, on his points about some other forms of intervention. I like Sam's idea about the notion of coaching. Some of the reasons why I think this is very important, and, incidentally, I should say, so that there is no misconstruing my criticism about psycho-diagnostics, I have gone through a post-doctoral training program in psychoanalysis and I have been a practicing psychotherapist on a part-time basis with children and adolescents, particularly with learning problems, so this isn't an attack on an alien profession. But in connection with working with such children and working with many Negro children in the last year and in working, also, with many other frustrated middle-class children, it seems to me that one effective way is through coaching, through tutoring. I have encountered any number of children who, I believe, would ordinarily be treated on a psychotherapeutic basis, and for whom, it seems to me, a tutoring approach is quite appropriate, and very often they are being subjected to psychotherapy.

Here are some of the reasons, some of the difficulties. If you think in terms of problems of attention in learning, here are some of the characteristics: First, the difficulty in attending to learning material in studying; the difficulties that stem from the inadequate skills; the difficulty in controlling the impulse toward immediate gratification; the impulsiveness that many such children show, quite understandably, like the maladapted children of the middle-class who have difficulties in learning; the little help available at home; the tendency to be overwhelmed by a task that's set before them. They don't know how to go about it. We don't teach in our schools how to study. We don't teach, really, how to engage in the process of doing homework. And those who do not have educated parents very often are at a disadvantage.

One outstanding method that we really can utilize now in our country is the use of able students to teach and coach others. When you have the adolescent struggling with his problem of identity, that adolescent who usually has not lost the humanistic values, this is a very positive outlet. Perhaps the chief obstacle would be in overcoming the concern of the parents that by helping other children he would not be able therefore to reach an ivy college, that it would affect his own grades. This is a direction that we might well pursue.

Finally, what relevance does this have to quality and equality? Well, it seems to me that the time will come when quality will be found to be considerably higher than we have ever appreciated. It seems to me that this will be a dynamic process; that there is no reason to believe that there is such a thing as an ultimate. Man has been a changing being, not so much because nature changed him but because he, by controlling and changing nature, changes himself in the process.

We can look forward to times when our problems concerning equality will be much less distressing and much less difficult to contend with than they are now, because we will not be faced, at least, with forms of stupidity which really are a blunting of consciousness, and we will not be faced with the various diverse forms of resistance to learning, which are a reflection of the conflicts of value in our culture reflected in the child.

RESPONSE
by
Samuel A. Kirk

What I tried to emphasize is not that psychotherapy is wrong, but, in the context of the school, the role of the school is educational remediation, the application of learning and the application of practical milieu operation to the development of children.

I am a little biased even against the term "therapy" because right after the war everybody became a therapist. We didn't talk about remediation or teaching kids to read; that was just too old-fashioned. We had to say "remedial therapy". So for that reason I exaggerated the other point, Fritz (Redl), and I do agree with him that there certainly is much more to diagnosis than handling a symptom. We have taken the idea from medicine because they, say, treat causes rather than symptoms.

If a child has measles, you don't put salve on his measles. Go after the cause. I don't think the same philosophy holds in education, that we treat causes. If a child didn't learn to read in the first grade because he had a very poor teacher and the teacher died that year and he went in the second grade, we have removed the cause -- if that's a simple method of a cause -- but the child still couldn't read.

Usually in a learning process, the child has mislearned or hasn't learned, and what we are doing in remediation is working at the child where he is, in order to direct his learning. We do that in remediation of disabilites of all kinds, and we use the principles of learning in modifying behavior.

Now I will admit that there are many problems that may not be solved as I indicated with nail-biters, I just gave that as an example, an example of the other point of view; because every time we brought a child around with some slight problem, we used the excuse that he needed psychiatric treatment; he needed therapy, but there weren't people like that around, and so he didn't get anything.

So what I am pleading for here is that we be practical, we have children in school, and that most of the time we can't give the psychotherapy to the parents. Even if that were the right thing to do, they won't come around for psychotherapy. We have to work with the child himself, and I gave that diagram there saying that one way of breaking the vicious circle is: you can work with the parents, hoping that they will help the child; or you can work with the child in a so-called psychotherapeutic setting; or you can work with his disabilities directly, hoping that this overlay that you talked about, Fritz, would be removed.

In other words, there is an inter-action there between cognitive functioning and emotional development, and that I think from a practical point of view we can do more for more kids if we base it on an adequate assessment of the child, find out what he needs to develop. I also emphasized the point that we work on the deficits rather than working on the assets, saying: well, he can't do this; we'll let this die. And we work on the things that he can do. So that if he can't do this or he can do this, we'll exaggerate this and let this be blotted out.

As a result, when we examine him at a later age there are marked discrepancies within the child with the remaining deficits. First we have to work on the deficits, elevate the deficits as far as possible, and also utilize the disabilities.

I made the statement that this is not a panacea for all ills, that we have to do many other things. But from a school point of view, from a teacher point of view, from a psycho-educational point of view, if we stress that, we'll get farther than just saying this is not out responsibility, give it to the social worker, give it to the psychologist, give it to the clinical psychologist.

The second point that has been alluded to was pre-nurseries and nurseries. I'd like to raise the question why do we have compulsory education at age six or age seven?

Why not age five? Why not at age four? Why not at age three? Why not at age twelve? How did we happen to start on this six shindig, or seven? Anybody know?

It's probably a religious concept originally, and we have included it in our laws, and now we think it's God-given. The nursey schools are usually private, and they exist only for parents who can pay the tuition in more advantaged areas of our communities.

Now, one of the things that I suggested here is that we extend the school, particularly for certain areas of our country and our communities way down to pre-nursery, and that this may be a prevention.

Now, Fritz mentioned the fact that I played up the I.Q. Why do we want to change I.Q.? I think we have exaggerated the use of the I.Q's and I think most school systems are giving intelligence tests to children all the time and they are using I.Q.'s. Ordinarily in our studies under current practices, as was mentioned, there is a correlation between school learning and mental age, and no matter what we do, we find that mental age correlates better with reading or success in reading than any other measure that we have, so we can't discard it because we don't like the mental age of the I.Q.

Now, maybe our job should be to decrease the reliability, the correlation of mental age and reading; and if we were to change our practices and get a lower correlation between mental age and reading, maybe we will get progress. So our problem in education is to decrease the correlation, rather than to increase it, with our standard measures.

Some of the speaker mentioned that I believed in the I.Q. and that the I.Q. was constant. I think my point of view is just the opposite. I think we assess a child with multi-dimensional functions such as the Binet, with many little factors. We haven't really said anything. When we say to the teacher this child's I.Q. is 80 or 90 or 110, we are classifying the child into a particular category for certain kinds of groupings. We are not telling the teacher what to do, nor are we giving her any cues with respect to the kind of curriculum or the program. This is a very weak instrument as far as education is concerned, or curriculum is concerned.

What I tried to emphasize is that one child with an I.Q. of 90 may require a different kind of an educational program than another chld with an I.Q. of 90. And we have evidence that some children learn differently because of different abilities, and for that reason the I.Q. is only a screening test, in a sense, as an initial measure for some sort of classification. The next step is to diagnose emotional or learning disabilities, or something of that sort, and in a diagnostic procedure you go through steps, one, two, three, you gradually go down.

Now, the kind of diagnosis in school that we ought to be doing is the diagnosis that leads to some sort of a program for the child. And Fritz has read and I have read and everyone else has read the psychological reports given to teachers. Teachers can read these reports and they are not at all helpful because they are usually classification reports. They give a Rorschach and say: this child is emotional. Or they give a reading test and a mental test and say: this child's mental age is nine but he is reading in the first grade; this child has a reading disability. And the teacher says: that's what the hell I sent him for, because he can't read. This great big diagnosis by these professionals telling me that he has a reading diability--! What she wants to know is what's wrong with his reading, what is the process of reading, what should she do now in her program of teaching reading in order to develop reading ability.

And I would say 75 or 80% of the reports that I read fall in that category, rather than into a category that helps the teacher. So I would say that we should talk about a classification instrument -- and the Binet test is a classification instrument -- and then we should develop diagnostic instruments and diagnostic procedures which would lead to some form of program for the children; and if it doesn't lead to a program, then the individual hasn't made a diagnosis, and I think that's what you have been saying.

Now, Fritz has said that I show a disrespect toward the clinical complexity. I think he is correct, in the way that I wrote the paper. You can't really go through all the ramifications of all the problems that humans have, that children have, in a paper. I tried to just hit a few highlights. But I do agree with him that it is a little bit over-simplified as I presented it.

Now, I think that we can talk about mass education on the one hand, we can talk about homogeneous grouping on the other, but I don't see how we could have quality and equality of education even with homogeneous grouping. That's one step. I think we will have to introduce into the school system psycho-educational diagnosticians and remedial experts that will elevate these children if they are not moving forward in heterogeneous or homogeneous groups.

Now, we do that. We employ speech correctionists in schools to work with individual children or small groups. We employ counselors to work with certain children on an individual basis. I am suggesting here that we will have to extend this practice to all kinds of disabilities which we find in children in a school system. This is expensive; it costs more; it requires higher training than being a teacher or a psychologist or a social worker, and we will have to train these specialists in these areas in the same way that the medical profession trains specialists over and above the internist to do specialized kinds of work. We shy away from that problem partly because it's expensive, and partly because we haven't developed psycho-educationally far enough to really do the job, if they did give us the money to do it. But I think that we will probably never develop unless we have a program that provides for this sort of intervention in schools and also training of personnel in colleges and universities.

I am not sure that I answered all of the criticisms, but I do want to say that I have attended a great number of meetings, some of them were medical meetings, some of them were education, psychological. In the medical profession someone found something called phenylketonuria, and they found that this is a genetic error of metabolism; that with proper diet at a very young age they can save the child from becoming mentally defective. Now, more money has gone into research, more speeches have been made in that area, but we only find about one phenylketonuric mentally retarded in 700 mentally deficient children. I mean if you cured all the phenylketonurics, you haven't made much of a dent. And yet they feel that this is important not only for its own sake but that maybe they will find others just like it.

Now it seems to me that if my thesis and Bloom's thesis are correct, that we can correct lower intelligence and lower learning ability and lower school learning in school by having a big program at the pre-school level, starting at the age of one or two or three, as early as we can go in a practical situation. My guess is that we can prevent 50% of the children now being assigned to classes for the mentally retarded in our school system. That is a guess. But we do find that over 50%, probably 70% of the children assigned to these classes do not have a known definitive medical diagnosis of pathology and that many of them come from the lower socio-economic areas of a community, and it is very likely that their lower intelligence is partially, at least -- how much, as you say, we don't know -- due to the child-rearing practice at an early age. And I think it would pay this country to look into this very seriously and attempt to at least raise that group up to the point where they can become more useful to themselves and to society.

ADDITIONAL QUERIES AND RESPONSES

Harold Taylor: I would say our experiments at Sarah Lawrence in this fashion indicate very clearly to those of us who are working there and those who have worked in this way elsewhere that the capacity of the individual need not be compared with the capacity of any other individual in order to measure development and growth.

I think if we can stick to those two basic qualities in the creation of certain conditions for learning, we will find that many of the problems, both in psychopathology and in educational pathology of a more conventional kind, can be overcome if we deliberately keep the situation open-ended and remove all conventional criteria and unblock those obstacles which Fritz was talking about in his survey of Sam Kirk and other matters.

Samuel A. Kirk: What I tried to emphasize is the importance of intra-individual differences; that is, the discrepancies of growth within the individual and the importance of sound devices to find out his low points and his high points.

Henry Dyer: It seems to me you abolish what you call conventional testing. You take away all measures but you still have people making judgments about people, don't you? To me this is the basis, this is just kind of inaccurate testing, inaccurate measuring, isn't it?

Milton Schwebel: I do want to make it clear I don't give a hang about the I.Q. itself. What I emphasize was the change in I.Q., as reflected as the result of some kind of intervention, as a criterion of change. I don't care what kind of criteria we use. I refer to the I.Q. simply as a reflection of certain changes which have occurred. So far as I am concerned, let us use others.

So far as testing in general is concerned, I certainly would agree that we make an over-abundant use of objective tests in colleges and universities, which I think are inconsistent with some of the objectives we set in the courses themselves.

As far as testing in general is concerned, in the schools it seems to me their only justification is when they are used not to classify and freeze but when to indicate the nature of the interventions, the nature of the acts which we would introduce in order to bring about the kinds of changes which are possible.

Melvin Tumin: Fritz (Redl), what would you do if you could have absolute command over all training of teachers? What would you do with regard to teaching? What are the indispensible ingredients, in your judgment, for training teachers to be open with regard to the open possibilities of the children?

Fritz Redl: That's no fair question. This is a question for another speech.

Oscar Cohen: I'd like to make two points. One bears on Tumin's dilemma and also relates to what Superintendent Martin of the Mt. Vernon Schools had to say earlier. He said with restraint that the world is not waiting for research to indicate the true paths and that a revolution is in process and a great deal is happening, whether or not your findings or your best judgment is made available.

Now, your best judgment is not being made available and the kinds of answers that Mel Tumin wants really could be given if at this point, to the best of your knowledge, you were to put down what you think is necessary.

We are propagandizing all the country for pre-school education. We are propagandizing for enriched education in the early grades. There is nothing definitive on the subject, but we have to move because lives are at stake. Hundreds of thousands of them are now headed for the scrap heap unless we do something. We are going to do the best we can with what information we have, and I know that we are making many mistakes.

So that my plea in this regard is that it's rather tragic that Mel has to ask this question, because Fritz Redl -- and I am not referring to him personally, but there are many Fritz Redl's -- have not put in writing the answers which they have. They are not definitive -- and they may have to revise them later -- but they are the best we have. These should have been put in writing long ago.

The second point I want to make deals with the discussion on the extent to which I.Q.'s can be raised or children benefit at one age level or not. The discussion would seem to assume that the individual child is in a laboratory situation, which is not the case. At an early age, pre-school age and kindergarten, the child does not have the alienation which it develops -- I am talking about the disadvantage child -- when, after a few years in school, it falls behind, is frustrated and is a failure. By the time that child reaches fifth grade, the little darling of kindergarten is now a hellion and is now destined, barring some kind of miracle, for the junkyard.

I think that the situational aspects should be considered when you discuss the raising of I.Q.'s at an early age. It's quite possible that at a later age he can do as well, and indeed Higher Horizons Programs in some respects seem to indicate that one could work with children, young people at a later age, but it is, I think, increasingly difficult, in view of what happens in the child's development and his alienation, frustration and anger with the failure which he is obviously incurring. I think that should be an element which should be stressed for those who are practitioners in the field.

Boris Ford: Could I intervene just a minute to make one brief point? I wonder if a lot of this evening's discussion isn't in a kind of way a reflection of our astonishing conformism and timidity as teachers as such.

It seems to me highly possible that the answer to Mel's question is that calculated eccentricity is the one thing we should try to insure we send out teachers as. The whole process of the training of teachers in our own country, maybe not in yours, is of course normative. We equip them, it seems to me, to carry out normal routine functions in an unimaginative way and suppose thereby that they are serving the community quite well.

In almost every subject one looks at, the calculated eccentric today in education tends on the whole to be dedicated. As we travel around schools, it is very hard today to find the near total eccentric freely at work and approved as such in the school situation. I think the consequence of this is that the kinds of education in relation to a given subject -- I am putting it as narrowly as that -- which the calculate eccentric might find himself experimenting with, are not found, and as a result what are not found are the incalculable consequences of calculated eccentricity.

We have so narrowed the range of educational performance and imaginative eccentricity that we have no conception what really genuine eccentricity in terms of our own subjects might do therapeutically for the children whom we have been discussing in the terms we have this evening. Our discussion of the enormous apparatus which we can't provide, of counselors, therapists, pre-nursery education and the rest of it, apparently stems from our failure to equip the teacher to do the enormously open-ended eccentric things which one would like them to do.

I can give a one-minute illustration of what immediately comes to mind in terms of my own subject, which is English, not looking back to this morning, Education. In England, at any rate, elite education in English Literature is enormously centered upon what we call practical criticism, the minute examination of the text.

Now, for a certain kind of individual, not ill-measured in terms of I.Q., you can get a good deal of distance, it seems to me, in this kind of work. For the great bulk, however, of the children or adults, this is quite misappropriate kind of exercise that tends on the while to destroy the text rather than to bring it alive.

And in my own experience, to set a group of adults or children and, above all teachers who are fantastically resistant toward being set a task of this kind, to -- for instance -- take a play like Lear and to give them one week or four days as a group of twenty people and say: now, look, your task is to do the following, your task is to spend four days or a week producing a commentary in dramatic terms upon that play; your commentary must last 35 minutes. You have until a week from now. Get on and do it. I think I've done this task with groups whose I.Q.'s have ranged from about 75 to 175 as adults, with groups of teachers whose I.Q.'s seemed to range often between the same span, and with groups of children of a wholly normal intellectual kind dotted with a few more intellectual. And the fantastic thing is that this sort of a task tends in every case to produce the most astonishingly creative imaginative results.

What I have discovered through doing this kind of wholly eccentric task, if I can call it that, is that it has enormous therapeutic consequences which, it seems to me, we have not begun to study. We haven't begun to study the by-products and the kick-backs and the advantages and the therapies that we gain out of the most inspired and eccentric pieces of teaching. And for lack of doing this, and because there isn't the teaching to observe this caliber, we have to build into our system this enormous battery of known teaching kinds of therapy-attention apparatus, intellectual attention and the rest of it.

And I only put in this plea, first because actually we do have teachers; we don't have therapists in the appropriate number. We still not have therapists in anything like the number to do the task if we approach it as therapists rather than to maximize the possible therapeutic consequences of totally eccentric teaching.

SESSION FOUR

Theme: EDUCATION IN THE SOCIAL SYSTEM: EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL INFLUENCES AFFECTING THE SCHOOL

Introduction	ELIZABETH GREENFIELD	1
Theme Paper and Supplementary Comments	JOHN C. FLANAGAN	1 - 18 d
Discussion	HERMAN H. LONG	19 - 22
Discussion	CLARENCE SENIOR	23 - 29
Response	JOHN C. FLANAGAN	30 - 31
Additional Queries and Comments		32 - 54

INTRODUCTION
by
Mrs. Elizabeth Greenfield

Dr. Long, as he came in, said we've gotten group conscious this morning. Actually, we had a discussion before you came, Dr. Long, about our hopes that we could really have a discussion this morning. Consequently, I am going to be fairly severe about the time of presentations. Hopefully, then, we'll get into the situation in which some of the differences of opinion which I sense in this group can be expressed. I think they have been expressed in formal ways. But I think that there are still a lot of people who have things on their chests that they'd like to get off, and we'd like to hear what they are.

With no further ado, then, Dr. Flanagan, if you will proceed.

SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS
by
John C. Flanagan

Let me say a few things about the problem of quality and equality in education.

This paper was written on the basis that the goals we have are individual fulfillment either as a person or as a contributor to society and responsible citizenship. A number of external factors affecting the schools are discussed at some length, a few internal factors are mentioned.

One of the important internal factors, as I see it, is the change in schools, especially at the secondary level, where 81% of 16- and 17-year-olds were in school in 1960, whereas in 1920 only 43% of 16- and 17-year-olds were in school.

The other factos, the importance of the superintendents, teachers, and textbooks have not come in for very much discussion, and I think they are a very important factor in the school.

Of course, the factor which has perhaps been neglected more than many others is the students. The point that I tried to make about the students is primarily how different they are, and what a big range of talent, both in level of ability and academic things and in various other ways, there is in the schools today. This is illustrated by pointing out the overlap, the fact that 25 to 30% of ninth graders already know more about most of the basic subjects than the average twelfth grade student.

I have also put in something on the level of achievement reached by the students in the segregated schools in the South as compared with the white schools there, to show the very great magnitude of the problem that we are talking about here.

A number of people at the Conference have made the point that equality means to them meeting the needs of each individual. If you agree with this view, it follows, as Jud Shaplin and Harold Taylor, among others, mentioned, that it is very important to have highly individualized education or instruction. This point I think cannot be over-emphasized because I think anything else is doomed to utter failure right at the beginning.

Now, there are various ways to get individualized instruction, and I think it would be very nice and some places are trying to use the tutorial system. I think if we had the resources, an approach such as the Sarah Lawrence one of using the tutorial system with everybody would be a very fine thing. However, this does require very great resources and so the alternative that I have proposed here is to use our technological aids, specifically the computer plus packaging things, having a library for them, being able to get easy access to them and cutting down on the time the teacher or tutor is needed to find out about progress being made.

I think one of the important points that I would like to stress is that the kind of evaluation of progress by tests, if you will, proposed in this approach to the solution of the problem is one which does not compare the capacities and abilities of an individual, as indicated by Dr. Taylor. When one wants to find out whether a person has learned French, it is very easy to find out how many words he has learned and whether he learned the set of words we gave him in the last couple of weeks or the last month. And you don't have to compare this with anybody else's performance. It is a measurement, a nice efficient tool which takes a lot less time than the teacher spending enough time to find out what he learned and what he didn't learn from conversation, but rather pointing out right away for you the words that he didn't learn, the concepts he didn't get, the grammar, the other things that he hasn't achieved yet, so as to know what he should do next.

And it is my hope that through proper units of material adjusted to the previous knowledge and the level and the rate of learning of the individual, that he can spend most of his time learning material, rather than, as I mentioned here, perhaps not much more than half of it learning, as now occurs in most schools, as many students are confronted with materials that they can't understand at all.

/

In one class I had some contact with recently, it was found that not a single student could read the reading textbook in this fifth grade class. But this teacher was maintaining very good discipline in the class. Now, this kind of situation needs to be removed entirely from the situation.

The other point that I would like to emphasize in this little introduction is the importance of motivation through goals. If we are planning our education to meet the individual student's needs, it is very important that he participate in and agree on both short-range goals and long-range goals. Now, for long-range goals he does need the kinds of tests and information which compare him to other groups, not necessarily with just his contemporaries but, if he thinks he is going to be a physicist, he needs to know how much mathematics he knows now, what his arithmetic reasoning ability is in respect to the people who go on to graduate work in physics. In our study, we find that these are the top group of any identifiable homogeneous group of this kind, that they have the highest average score in more than half of the 28 tests we used in our survey, as far as cognitive and achievement measures are concerned. But it is quite important that he know this and not be such as the people planning mathematics, who are actually in the lower half of the twelfth grade general academic ability group. This is utterly unrealistic. None of them will ever graduate with a degree of mathematics from a reasonable institution, yet very many of them think they will. So they need some kinds of tests or other way of getting the information as to how they fit with people who correspond to their long-range goals, because the long-range goals are utterly unrealistic at the present time.

Of course, one of the very nice features of the proposed system using the computers is that you get immediate feed-back from every unit assigned to a student. The student works on this particular two-week or four-week assignment. He takes an examination and immediately you know did he really learn about 90% of this or more, or was it unsuited to hime or is there some other factor working in the situation to distract him, or had we a wrong estimate of his abilities. This way we can constantly improve the materials assigned to each student, the learning experiences that he undertakes so that they are maximally effective with all the students. At the same time we can constantly work with him on the long-range goals.

Someone said that arousing motivation was the main thing in education. Well, it is our experience, based on various research studies, that the best way to arouse motivation is through success in making progress toward your goal, and this is true with both short-range goals and long-range goals, that this kind of accomplishment in terms of one's own value system with respect to these goals is the best kind of motivation there is. We hope that by getting appropriate experiences we can maximize this.

DISCUSSION
by
Herman H. Long

I should admit that my discussion and evaluation of this contribution essentially is based upon a difference in tastes rather than an intellectual difference, in terms of a basic attack. Because I happen to have the tastes that I do, I take the tack that I do in discussing this paper.

I benefitted greatly from the ideas it contained, from the information it contained, from the application of some research findings to the problem that we have been defining or attempting to define.

I was not convinced that in this discussion we had not again escaped the central cut of our considerations. I asked myself at the beginning what I thought essentially Dr. Flanagan was saying to us. I feel the need to restate what I think he has said to us.

There is no explicitly stated thesis in the paper. The implicit thesis is that cultural forces are producing pressures upon American education, creating both problems and opportunities. Dr. Flanagan identifies these pressures that are interacting with the goals of the culture, and hopefully, interacting with what he states as our primary educational goals: the enhancing of dignity; the promotion of maximum development of capacities and their responsible exercise; the widening of the range of effectiveness of individual choices -- a goal which he adopts from the President's Commission on National Goals. These cultural factors mediate between the achievement of the goals and the actual interventions which are attempted in the educational process itself.

The intervening factors which determine the kinds of adjustments that need to be made in the educational process to achieve these rather large and important goals, are not the factors that I would have thought were most germane to this discussion, though maybe germane in the larger frame. But I do not believe they advance us to a more direct confrontation with the specific issues of this meeting.

Dr. Flanagan's solution is essentially that of providing an education which is appropriate to the individual, rather than providing the same education to all. He proposes the use of technological aids, especially computer processes, as a means of identifying the objectives in more specific terms. I think this is highly useful and wise.

Secondly, he identifies the procedures which can be developed for evaluating the potential of the individual for progress toward these general objectives, as well as toward the secondary set of more specified objectives which he would propose to be arrived at through careful and thoughtful use of the computer process.

He proposes also to use the computer to collect data that will determine the effectiveness of these various intervening instructional procedures that are aimed at mediating the gap between the needs of the individual and the needs that are implicit in the goals of society and goals in the educational process.

I think this general scheme certainly is a thoughtful, useful, necessary example of the kind of engineering that needs to be attempted in this general area if we are to achieve goals of quality in education. I assume he means in this case the most effective and efficient relating of educational demands and challenges to the qualities of mind and spirit and imagination that are represented in the individuals who are involved in this process.

In the course of this general attack upon the problem, Dr. Flanagan cites among the complicating factors the fact that our situation is new because we have so many more students to educate. They represent a wider range of abilities and backgrounds than we had a generation ago, and he makes incidental reference to some data that have come out of Project Talent, in which he shows the tremendous disparity between the achievement levels of Negro students from 48 schools. I am not sure how these were selected, whether they were representative or whether they came from Florida or Florida and Alabama and some other states, or what -- but at least 48 Negro schools, and unfortunately, I think he proceeds to use language which infers that this is true of all Negro students. We get the impression that the Negro student that we are dealing with, and that education has to deal with, and presumably higher education especially -- I happen to be dealing with these students -- are students who are reading at the ninth percentile level of achievement of the graduates of the white high school seniors.

This may be true, but if it is true, then the question that rises in my mind is: Does the procedure that Dr. Flanagan advances meet the problem? I have come up with the impression that it does not meet the problem of inequality as it reflects itself in the chronic case of the classes of the population -- Negro, lower class or otherwise -- who represent the kind of disparity from the average in achievement, or in the extent to which the educational process has aided the development of the potential of other individuals in the society.

It meets it only if one assumes that the emphasis upon individualized diagnoses of needs and abilities in relation to goals would somehow meet this problem. For the procedure Dr. Flanagan proposes fails to take into consideration that the realities of the educational world involve a set of factors which are immediate and perhaps are going to be immediate for a long time. This reality is simply that there are segments of a society which consist of educational classes or groups of varying degrees of chronic disability.

What does this mean for students who are being educated in the segregated schools, whether they are segregated by race or culture, or income, or class, or nationality, or language? What does this mean in terms of the organization of a program of diagnosis and an analysis of methods of approach? I am wary of any attack upon this problem that operates with an economic theory of the past which holds that if you provide certain goods for the advantaged segments of the society, they will trickle down ultimately to the people who need them most.

I am not sure that a proposal such as this can be properly implemented. For the most pressing need is that a remedial program shall be directly focussed on these crucial publics with which we are dealing in the educational challenge before us. I am not sure that we are going to get the task done.

We seem to have suffered in this conference from an effort, conscious or unconscious, to avoid direct confrontation with the issues. It seems to me that if the flights that we have had to philosophic profundity or general educational principles have any merit at all, they do so by implication. And we have not, it seems to me, shown their relevance to our problems. It is this absence of application that troubles me. Even if we make errors, even if our guesses are not the best guesses, it seems to me we have been called upon to make some of these guesses. And I am saying that these guesses are not before us in this discussion. I suppose it may be all due to a human failing of which all of us are victims; that is, when we come to difficult problems we very cleverly find ways in which we can avoid facing the problems directly.

So we have resorted -- I am not sure that it has been helpful -- we have resorted to and struggled with totalities, ultimate solutions, even solutions which have been societal in their scope, which have attempted to design perfect philosophic systems, intellectual systems, rather than with solutions or proposals that are pragmatically based and are aimed at the real, hard, and immediate questions before us. Of course, I am as guilty and responsible for this failure as anyone in this conference.

DISCUSSION
by
Clarence Senior

I am going to talk mostly about the internal pressures on the school system, since that's what I have been subject to for the last three years as a member of the Board of Education in New York City.

First, may I add to the external factors just one thing, and its corollary, which I think Mr. Flanagan didn't stress; that is, what I believe is miscalled the Negro Revolution. I'd rather call it the Civil Rights Revolution, because this is something to try to make democracy meaningful for the whole of American life instead of just for a section of the population.

Second, the changing character of central cities. You probably saw the New York Times story the other day about segregation increasing in cities in the United States. Fortunately, New York City is one of those in which it didn't increase from 1950 to 1960, but the number of percentage points that we decreased in our segregation index was only 8. So although that's about 10 per cent, a little over, it is nothing to be particularly proud of.

Our Negro population in the schools from 1957 to 1958 to 1963 to 1964 increased in the elementary schools about 48 per cent, in the junior high schools by 75 per cent, in the academic high schools by 71 per cent, in the vocational schools by 8 per cent, for a total of 264,616 Negro children in our schools.

Now the Negroes, of course, vary, depending on where they come from, their background, the family class, etc. If they come from other metropolitan areas, that's one thing. If they come from northern cities, that's another thing. If they come from southern cities, it's still another. If they come from southern rural areas, it's still another.

In addition to this, the lowest visible immigration group which is starting at the bottom rung of the occupational ladder by and large, as our ancestors did, are the Puerto Ricans. Quite a few of their problems parallel those of the Negroes and quite a few are different. Of course there are differences in the Puerto Rican experience, but in New York City they are lumped together. And, furthermore, to do more damage, they are lumped together with the Negroes, so that almost invariably you hear Negro and Puerto Rican, as though they were one and the same, when, in fact, they are very different groups.

Our elementary school Puerto Rican population increased by 37 percent, junior high school by 36 percent, academic high school by 74 percent, and vocational by 8 percent in this same period, for a total of 167,000 Puerto Rican children in addition to the 264,000 Negro children.

In addition to this, we have a good many other outsiders, not all of them visible. We have almost 40,000 youngsters transferred in from other school systems, most of them from school systems nowhere near the quite inadequate level of the New York City Public School system. But the ones that we admitted were from school systems much less adequate than ours; 22,000 from other continental states, almost 9,000 from the Southern Atlantic states, 9,400 and some from foreign countries, 7,900 from Puerto Rico in this last school year.

New York has always been a cosmopolitan multi-lingual city. We use 17 languages on our radios every day in New York City. But the people who have "arrived" in New York City have forgotten their own history and they have forgotten the history of New York City, so that we lump all the newcomers together as a problem. This tendency is very widespread, and of course, it's one of the things which does a good deal of damage to the newcomer.

Into this situation is plunged a group of nine people (the New York City Board of Education) who, by and large, think -- and I am going to use all four of the verbs that I have picked up in the last couple of days -- that we're going to revolutionize, or we're going to reform, or we're going to innovate, or,to use Martin Mayer's phrase, we're going to gamble.

How do we go about this? We are thoroughly committed to equality of concern for every child irrespective of his background or his group membership. That is, we are committed to doing as much as we possibly can for every child. But in a society such as ours, how far can the school go? I happen to have been brought up on George Count's pamphlet, "Care the School Build a New Social Order?", and I wish to God we could try harder than we have been trying.

We would, of course, run into the kinds of pressures that are documented in this very interesting little pamphlet the American Civil Liberties Union got out on censorship and outside pressures. The Anti-Defamation League has been responsible for a couple of books on the kinds of pressures that are brought from the outside on school boards.

Let me deal with a more difficult problem, namely, the pressures from the inside of the system on whichever of these four verbs you want to take in trying to clean up a mess and to go ahead.

We also, of course, have the deepest possible commitment to quality education, and the corollary of this, of course, is there have got to be some changes made.

My reaction after a couple of months on the Board was to write a book called, "Innocents Aboard." We found that under the old superintendent the Board was manipulated in the interests of what the superintendent conceived were the interests of the school system. When the old superintendent departed, we hired firms to look all over the country to try to find the best new superintendent. We had a tremendously able, dedicated, sincere, honest, capable resourceful man as the president of our board, whose heart was almost broken because, before the creme de la creme of educators in New York calling themselves the Academy of Education, he announced that the board was looking all over the country to find the best possible new superintendent, and he was rewarded with resounding boos. That's the reason I used the words "Innocents" because we simply didn't know what we were up against.

Mr. Flanagan has used the words "inertia" and "tradition", and that's good as far as it goes, because God knows they are there. But I am talking about outright hostility to improvements on the part of the bureaucracy which in the New York City school system numbers 75,000 persons.

New York, of course, presents special problems, as is well known, for a variety of reasons. There is first its cosmopolitan character. There is, second, a range of problems which the school system itself gives to the newcomers, and always has, if only because one of the latent functions of a school system is to help wreck the family of the newcomer by supplying a differential source of authority for families where there was a source of authority already agreed upon. These are, of course, familiar to sociologists. Read, for instance, the appendix to a very fine book which most people, unfortunately, don't know, because it sounds like it's about what my father used to call the long-haired men and short-haired women of Greenwich Village -- a book about Greenwich Village by Caroline Ware, which has an appendix called "The Contribution of the Public School to the Maladaptation of the Italian Child." This was written in the late '20's, and it's a beautiful piece of sociological analysis in the field of education.

Because of all of these things, we started a campaign which eventually was successful: we abolished mass IQ testing in the New York City schools. Now we know that this is only the beginning of a process of trying to educate the teachers. Incidentally, we got a resounding denunciation of the Board by the Council of Supervisory Organizations of New York City for this move. The supervisors would say to me: "But, look, it's only an achievement test." And I said: "Of course, I know it's only an achievement test. Then why don't we make it an achievement test and call it an achiement test?" Because if you call it an intelligence test, there is an implication that there is something inherently inferior about this kind, because if he doesn't understand English and you give him a test in English, and he only makes 73, he is sent to a reform school in upstate New York. I am talking literally about our experience with some of the Puerto Rican kids who ended up in Wassaic. And the Puerto Rican parents had to get lawyers to spring their kids because they were given intelligence tests in a language which they didn't understand.

And one of the few times I quoted with approval one of the real pillars of the establishment in the United States -- James Conant -- was when he said: When you give a child an IQ score at an early age, you brand him throughout life. But we still have to educate our teachers and our supervisors to these things.

I was delighted last night to see the reference in Mr. Kirk's paper about Binet. I join him and wish to God that Binet had lived long enough to destroy some of the foundations for one of the superstitions which the chairman mentioned last night, which is, that the IQ tests measure something innate in a person.

Our next job is to try to tackle the whole set of superstitions regarding homogeneous groupings.

I want to reiterate the problems arising from the resistance of teachers and supervisors. I don't mean all of them, because we've got some good teachers and we've got some good supervisors, but they are not the ones who bring the pressure. I'm talking about the ones who bring the pressures. And, incidentally, we've got some darned good schools in our slum areas in New York City, and one of the reasons we have is that we've got good principals who believe that no matter where a child comes from he can be taught. And a good principal can recruit good teachers even under very unfavorable circumstances. And we've got some really prize schools in buildings that are damn near falling to pieces, where rats run around, where ceilings fall off. We are literally 20 years behind in our maintenance and repair program in the New York City schools.

Mr. Mayer may well say, and I agree with him partially, that additional money isn't going to do everything. But money for repairs and maintenance would come in damn handy when we are 20 years behind in this kind of thing.

As Dave Salten said yesterday, too many teachers don't like children, and this is particularly true if they are minority group children who are visible in the classroom, who introduce problems that the teacher isn't able to handle. And as Martin Trow said yesterday, the teacher is afraid of these kids. If a teacher is afraid of the children, of course, you are liable to get the kind of thing that appeared in the Atlantic Monthly a couple of years ago. You can't teach him anything, and then this spreads all over the system and all over the country and gives the teacher who is having these problems an excuse for saying: "Well, look, it's in the Atlantic Monthly." I personally happen to think that it would work the other way, as far as the Atlantic Monthly is concerned.

We have inherited, also, a tremendously complex system of allowing books into our library. One of the problems was that we had a very Puritanical, very high official of the school system who said that no art books would be allowed in our libraries if they contained nudes. You can imagine what would happen to El Greco or almost anybody else who's ever painted anything of any importance if none of his books would be allowed in our library system if it contained a nude.

Now I'm talking about exact situations that we ran up against. We finally said that anything that's good enough to be listed by the American Library Association is good enough for the school libraries of New York City -- period. And that's what is happening now, but we had to fight about it.

Of course, during the McCarthy era, we had some of his followers on the Board, and we had to clean up the messes that were left by them. There was both active and passive resistance to that.

We needed new personnel besides a new superintendent. The old superintendent appointed a committee to look around for a new group of associate and assistant superintendents, at our request. One of the persons sitting in this room would have been on the staff of the New York City public school system if it hadn't been for the deliberate sabotage by the chairman of that committee, who was the highest-ranking and oldest member of our staff under the old superintendent. I don't know whether he things that's good or bad. I think it's very bad for our school system and probably very good for somebody else who got him.

We decided that we needed more minority group teachers. We started special coaching programs for Puerto Rican and Negro teachers, and then other teachers said: If you are going to do that for them, you've got to do it for us. So we did it for them, too. We should have done it in the first place. But this is just one illustration of the way in which the push of minority groups sometimes helps all of the teachers.

And then we put on a special campaign to try to get people aware of the historical background of Puerto Rico. We started some classes in subject matter in Spanish, and then we got it from the -- I won't mention the specific names, but let's say the X's and the Y's and the Z's, who said the school system did nothing like this for us when we came, so why should you do it for the Puerto Ricans?

In addition to this we have three very powerful teachers' organizations in New York City: the Catholic Teachers Association, the Jewish Teachers

Association, and the Protestant Teachers Association. You can draw your own conclusions.

Then we set out deliberately to reconstitute and re-invigorate 25 local school boards. These local school boards have been exceptionally valuable to us, and they have been a hell of a headache. They have turned into a pressure group. I hope I'm partly responsible for the fact that some of them have really been damn nuisances, because I'm on the Committee on Local School Boards, and I was in charge of the orientation of the selection panels for them. I urged the panels to be sure to get at least one gadfly on every board. We got them. We asked for them, and we got them, but these have been invaluable.

I'll use just one illustration. I don't know whether I want to label him a gadfly or not, but one of the participants in the Conference greeted me the other night and scarcely had said, "Hello, Clarence", before he said, "Is it true that--".

In closing, since I think I've got about two more minutes of the five you've warned me about three minutes ago, we recognize the United Federation of Teachers. I don't see John Martin here this morning, but I agree entirely with what he said yesterday about the need for teachers to become more troublesome to school boards, otherwise school boards will be captured by the bureaucracy and the prisoners of the bureaucracy. The UFT has been both a tremendously good influence and a damn headache. To deal with it we have set up a grievance procedure. The first year nothing was done except handling individual grievances, aside from the big push for increased salaries, which God knows they need. But it has released and at least channelized some of the formerly unspoken hostilities between the teachers and the principals. And although we've got some darn good principals, we've also got some insufferable martinets. I suppose the theory is that the board pushes the superintendent, the superintendent pushes the deputy superintendent, the deputy pushes the associates, the associates push the assistants, the assistants push the principals, and so there's nobody left except the teacher, who gets pushed -- and so she can only kick the kids around.

This is the kind of thing I hope will be relieved by the fact that we now have legal machinery set up to take care of those complaints which start from the bottom. They can now be carried right to the top, to free the teachers for the two essential jobs: one, teaching as the kids should be taught; and two, criticizing the curriculum, the procedures, and the policies, and anything else about the Board of Education they feel like criticizing.

One final point about the UFT. We asked them how we were going to get teachers into the slum schools -- and I am using shorthand here instead of circumlocutions -- and they said we must improve the schools. We said all right, but how do you do it? So they came up with a very elaborate plan. Of course, it only cost a few hundred million dollars more. But we sat them down with the Council of Supervisors and some of the top brass on our staff, and they worked out what is called The More Effective Schools Plan. So now we have incorporated the

UFT and the supervisors, who took the lesson from the UFT and organized their own union (they now want union recognition -- and I'm pulling the foreman cases from the Supreme Court on them). But anyway, we'll fight that one when we come to it. So we do have some more effective schools.

I am not going to deal with the external pressures, except to say that we are very fortunate in New York in having some pressures for education as well as some pressures for all of these special group interests. We've got the Public Education Association, which is 35 years old, about which a book was recently written telling how important it was in helping the school system in New York. We've got the United Parents Association, which is tremendously helpful, and we've got the Citizens Committee on Children, which is tremendously helpful.

I've talked with board members in other places who have none of these things. The citizens' organizations simply haven't organized to put pressure on the school board for quality education. You have to have that kind of citizen pressure exerted on boards, otherwise the anti-education people, no matter what their particular slogan is, are going to be much too influential on boards.

RESPONSE
by
John C. Flanagan

The first point I want to state quite emphatically is that this refers to the average student, and there are some Negro students in these schools who read quite well. On the other hand, if you look at the number of Negro students who got National Merit Scholarship finalist positions, you find that they are few.

If you look at this whole picture of ninth, tenth, eleventh and twelfth grade, you want to say: well, we'd better begin, whether Mr. Bloom knows anthing or not, down at the pre-school level and the early years of the elementary school. Because it is very difficult to do an adequate remedial job, to provide all the remediation, to use Kirk's term, that is essential to bringing these talents out at this higher level. And the point that I was trying to make was the size of the problem. Some of our staff members hunted very hard for a large number of Negro students in these segregated schools, because we don't know anything about the other Negro students, because we didn't ask for race; we asked the principal: what percentage of your people are Negro, and so we were very easily able to say something about the all-Negro schools or the all-white schools, but we are not able to talk about individuals. But is seems to me that it was quite important to see that those Negroes who were relatively high had some way or other, in spite of handicaps, developed their talents, their achievements, their abilities, their skills, nearly all were headed to college. So that the problem isn't that we have a lot of high school students who are just not being given opportunities to go to college, with the Negro people--at least the ones we were able to identify in the South and so on; it is that they have to be helped long before this to get up to reasonable levels so that they could attend a college.

The second point in Dr. Long's remarks that I wanted to comment on was his statement about my approach. There is no question but my approach is quality for all, and not better education for the disadvantaged or the underprivileged, or whatever, or the Negroes. It is definitely an all-out approach to try to improve the education.

However, although one says that this is for all, the facts are that the best job in education today--and it's a lot better job than was being done ten years ago--is being done for the gifted. The better people are being allowed by the schools to learn at more nearly their own rate now, in most of the large schools in the country. There are still quite a few places that hold them back, but more and more we have the attitude of the teacher in one of the college towns, who said to these five boys: just don't pay any attention to recitation if you don't want to. Sit in the back of the room and when you finish this book, doing every other problem, I'll give you another one. This group of boys, by the time they were juniors in high school had been through calculus, at least the one whose father was telling me the story, had a perfect or at least as high a score as the College Board gives, 800 in mathematics as a junior. So there are lots of teachers--of course, that's my example of master teaching: sit in the ack of the room and don't bother me, and when you finish this book, we'll find you another one. But this is easy, relatively speaking, and can be done for the top people.

This cannot be done for the people down the line, and that is why an approach such as this, it seems to me, is very important.

On Dr. Senior's remarks, I would like to also cast my vote against the I.Q. We, of course, did not use any so-called I.Q. tests in our Project Talent survey. Of course, my vote is not against testing at all, but I think that having a single measure such as theI.Q., with all the mistaken concepts that have developed about it, is unfortunate, And I agree also with what Henry Dyer said the other night, that we have multidimensionality, and we shouldn't give the academic aptitude kind of thing the high status that it has achieved, and also the suggestion that this is inborn and that this cannot be changed.

On the other main kind of remark, I think that although we haven't gotten far enough along with the approach as outlined our tentative exploration suggests that it's going to be much easier to find superintendents, in spite of what John Martin said about these superintendents, who will be quite willing and eager to go ahead with an approach such as is outlined than it will be to get teachers and other members of the school organization who are at all enthusiastic or willing to go along with as revolutionary an approach as is proposed here to try to improve education.

However, I think that this can be done and as we move along through the leadership of superintendents, principals, and those few people that are being prepared by some of our better institutions to take leadership in the schools, that once there is a clear demonstration of effectiveness, that the schools will follow along, at least that's the hope.

ADDITIONAL QUERIES AND COMMENTS

Martin Mayer: Dr. Flanagan's paper is what provoked my outburst against behavioral science the first evening and I think we have identifies the end with the phrase that the schools are now, bless their hearts, allowing bright children to learn, This concept of "allow" is all the way through this paper. This concept of central control, of dictatorship, of authoritarian administration of schools, you will get superintendents to go along with this gladly.

And, frankly, to talk about an education that meets the needs of the children in the schools after we have determined what their needs are does not strike me as fair or right at all. The schools do children a lot of damage by making their determination about what his needs and his capabilities are.

I want to see this sort of thing limited as narrowly as we can limit it. Obviously you can't get away from it. But anything which relies on these inadequate measures, unless Dr. Dyer can develop a real good energy measure to go with it, and unless we can do something about the enormous differences in what these kids come to school with before we start applying these damn measures, I think is going to produce social retrogression of the most serious kind in the school systems.

The one thing I would agree with Dr. Flanagan about is that you could sell this to any superintendent in the world and you could probably even sell it to the UFT, which is developing a similar central apparatus to try between the two of them--the two kings are going to join together and shake hands and decide what's going to happen with all of the kids. Some body really has to fight this, and I wish to be on the spearhead at this moment.

John Flanagan: Who is going to decide?

Mayer: What do you mean, who is going to decide: Give the kids more of a chance and give the teachers more of a chance.

Flanagan: Six-years-olds?

Mayer: --a case which Dr. Dyer knows about in which a kid was sent in to a mentally-retarded class in New York City over the screaming and howling objections of the teachers because the allegedly professional psychologists of the school system in their tests had said this child was mentally retarded. The story is in Hillel Black's wretched book. But this sort of thing in one form or another is happening all the time in our schools because people with inadequate measure - ment, with inadequate brains to talk about goals and objectives are setting their damn common sense petty bourgeois meaningless tasks to these kids and then setting them partly in a frame that this is to easy to examine for.

We must get rid of this, really we mustn't extend it. O.K., I am going to shut up now. But I see this happening to real children every day.

Flanagan: The only reply I can make to this is that we propose to have people with brains and people with good measures in this system.

Mayer: O.K. Find them first and then propose it. You don't have them now.

Herman Long: Couldn't you feed this dimension into your computer and come out with this element?

Flanagan: Yes.

Long: Since you are asking for self-appraisal of the teachers.

John Powell: The kids who are allegedly going to have this well-differentiated individual attention and evaluation are increasingly going to wind up as freshmen in colleges so overcrowed that they have resorted to technological instrumentation. They are precisely the kind that is sometimes of help when you have a small enough teacher-pupil ratio.

Let me describe myself to you as a freshman at the University of Miami. I ar required to take, among other things, a course called "Humanities." In that course in each semester one lecturer lectures on all the subjects in the Humanities over a chronological period from Egypt to the Renaissance--painting, music, architecture, philosophy, what have you. Twice a week I sit in a pie-sliced classroom with 299 other students, where I hear that lecture over television because it has to be given to 1800 students at once. Once a week I have 50 minutes in a seminar of 20 people under an instructor who may be expert in one of those Humanities fields, but not in all of them, and who is carrying 12 such seminars every week, thus dealing with 240 students.

Then once a week I go into a two-hour compositon class, the first hour of which is automated presentation, slide and voice hooked together, followed by discussion with a teacher who corrects my punctuation. And if I seem recalcitrant about punctuation, I'm given a little piece of paper which allows me into a small library room where I sit in front of a program teaching machine and take ten lessons in punctuatuion before I go back to the composition class.

In 15 weeks, in one of my three credit courses, I have had 13 meetings, because we have to take out two for exams, which are objective tests--I have had 13 meetings with a live human being.

My objective tests are--I score them on IBM cards with an electrographic pencil and the IBM computer within 24 hours tells me what my score is, how many right I got, how many wrong I got, where I goofed, how many students got the different questions wrong, item analysis, everything the teacher wants to know--nothing that gives any incentive to the student. And I have two years of this to face.

Now, in my social studies course I get three lectures a week by television and I don't have to go to a seminar because we don't have enough social studies teachers so that we have voluntary seminars. I get three lectures a week by television in natural science in which I am retaught what I learned in high school about physics and chemistry and biology, if I learned anything.

The demonstrations are by television. I have no contact with the laboratroy. If I am in trouble, I can go to an occasional clinical conference ith a member of the science staff.

It may be that I have had as many as 25 to 50 individual contacts with a live teacher in the course of one semester, nine credits' worth of work.

This is the use of instrumentation, instrumental technology at its first rawest and crudest and, believe me, we as well as the students are aware of this deadening sameness, and my principal job down there has been to help devise and incite ways of breaking this down, decreasing the amount of television increasing the amount of contact. But I am working against the fact that this is an independent university. We don't even know how many teachers we can hire in September until we know how many freshmen are going to pay their entrance fees, because that's what we live on.

But the State of Florida boasts the fact that it has one of the most complete closed-circuit television networks in the nation where, from a single studio, 25 to 50 high school and junior colleges in all parts of the state are fed their lectures in history or in biology.

Sure, we have the teaching machines, we have the closed-circuit television. What we fail to have is an exciting and meaningful curriculum, and our problem is to make a curriculum meaningful and exciting through the instrumental intervention between the teacher and the student. And we are not alone. This, I think, is going to be contended with and is being contended with at Michigan State and God knows how many other institutions that are gradually being overwhelmed by the entering freshmen.

I think the technology can eventually be subdued, although all of us doubt really whether we can subdue the technology that we ourselves have developed.

I would myself, give every entering freshman a copy Erewhon to read and let him take it from there, but this creates chaos in a mass situation.

Miriam Goldberg: It seems to me that all through this Conference something that Mr. Schwabel said yesterday should be given a little more consideration, and this is a historical look at some of the issues which we are facing. I have a feeling all the way through that we are once again, as we have done in certainly American education over the years, throwoing out the baby with the bath-water. We've done this so many times and we've got to backtrack.

But it does seem to me around this group that we have had attacks on methods, procedures in research and measurement which have been extremely useful, which have helped move education forward and we have had them attacked not because of their inherent inadequacies, not even because they aren't used or appropriate, but in terms of their own uselessness or even danger.

I don't object to throwing out the I.Q. as a measure. I think this was probably a wise decision. But I think that throwing out the concept of assesing youngsters' ability, at some one given point in time, to perform certain kinds of tests, is a highly relevant notion to education, and just throwing it our before we have some substitute, before we understand what we want to measure I think is, again, a process which we have gone through so many times before.

We threw out subject matter in the '20's and '30's, so to speak, because of a mistaken interpretation of Dewey and a mistaken interpretation by his followers of what he had intended perhaps for other reasons. Then we were suddenly forced back into relooking at subject matter and bringing it back into the curriculum.

I think one thing that we know is that teachers have kinds of normal distribution curves built into their heads and they are very often irrelevant to the normal distribution curve that's available to them in terms of an actual spread of scores on some broad basis. They used to call this the Yugoslav Effect, because Yugoslavs did a study in which they found that teachers graded from A to D on a narrow distribution in their own classes, and then when they gave some sort of a national exam, they found that a lot of A students in these classes ended up in D's in the normal curve for the total population. The teacher has a basis of assessment and it has nothing to do with whether you give him a piece of paper on which a score is noted or not.

I think what's more inportant than throwing out the tests or complaining about the damage that they do for us is to consider ways in which you can get teachers to become aware of the damage. We miseducated teachers for a long time, and I think we have a responsibility to repair the damage, it you will, but not by, once again, going with the pendulum or the bandwagon, or whatever effect operates in American education to get us out of where we were, and it's all bad and it's all wrong, and on to new and better things. But very often we have vaery little evidence about how much better the new things are. They just seem good at this time.

And so I really would like to inject one note of caution here before we throw away everything we have developed.

I am not sure that we have the facilities now to do the kind of goal assessment or even assistance to pupils which Dr. Flanagan suggests. I don't think he feels that we have all the means and procedures to do this adequately.

But I think the job is to look for more adequate means and procedures, rather than say: let's abandon the enterprise.

Clarence Senior: If I gave the impression that we threw out all tests in New York, I certainly mis-spoke. Not only that, but we have contracted with the Educational Testing Service to get us a new kind of test which, among ourselves, we call Pupil Watcher Test. And we contracted with another organization to get us another kind of a test, but as achievement tests, not as so-called intelligence tests.

Henry Dyer: These are really diagnostic tests to tell the teacher what to do next to the first-grade kid. They are not tests that are trying to predict how we do it. They are tests of where he is, to guide the teacher in the diagnostic job, which is what we are talking about.

David Salten: I want to allay Martin Mayer's anxiety by assuring him there will be a certain number of superintendents who will [illegible] quickly but Dr. Flanagan's proposal. I,myself, believe that the testing movement has made an enormous contribution to the effectiveness of public education in this country. But I also believe it has had a number of very unfortunate effects. Two of the more serious ones: first, the continual narrowing of the curriculum for the teacher is done with a view to not making changes in behavior which is socially effective but to producing the kind of change which is precisely measureable, and since you can measure something precisely, this is what we continue to teach for; However, most of our.

skills in the social studies, and our command of language, both written and oral, since they don't lend themselves to precise, crisp quantification, tend to be omitted. This, I think, has had an extraordinarily bad effect on American education.

Secondly, although the examinations presumably are diagnostic, they do strongly affect the expectations of teachers, and once teachers are given some additional support for the prejudice they are already inclined to hold, they are looking at kids who don't speak English well, are poorly dressed--and in addition, you give them the evidence of standardized tests--they have everything they need to conclude these children cannot learn.

These two effects, I think, have had a devastating effect on education.

What I find dangerous in Dr. Flanagan's proposal is this: first, there was the attractiveness of the computer, because I am convinced that education, along with every other human enterprise, has to be more productive than it now is and therefore we must look towards an increasing use of technology in education. And the resistance of our people to this technology is a disappointment to all of us.

However, once again the computer, unfortunately--you know, with binary characteristics, moves exactly toward an accentuation of those aspects of the testing movement which are already strangling us.

If you can use computer devices and different kinds of modern technology to expand the educational horizons of children, that's all well and good. If we can make teachers more productive than they now are and make the teaching and learning task simpler than it now is, fine. But because the computer lends itself to a further use of tests of the multiple choice variety, or the true-false variety, of objective tests, so to speak, and keeps cutting out the subjective developments, I think we are just putting more tentacles on this monster which is embracing American education.

Now, what's going to happen, should this continue to grow, is that people are going to get impatient at whacking off these tentacles one by one and they are going to stab at the hear of the monster. This would be unfortunate, as Miriam says, because if we were suddenly to throw out the entire testing apparatus, I think American education would have lost something. Somehow or other we must retain the effective elements of assessment.

Obviosly, if you don't know where you are, you don't know where you are going or you can't get where you want to effectively. So obviously measurement has a place in education. But I think we must face the very painful fact that measurement up to now, this overwhelming use of so-called objective, precise measurement has misled teachers who, in the first place, don't understand the philosophy of measurement, don't understand the lack of precision involved in these so-called measures, and most important of all in their own self-interest, to make themselves look good, teach material which is easily codifiable. And how you make decent citizens of people who command the language when you restrict your view that narrowly is going to remain a mystery to me.

Flanagan: Well, I think that I just didn't communicate if I didn't get the idea across very definitely that I thought the tests that we have at the present time are quite inadequate. They are the wrong frame of reference. They are very inappropriate for the kind of system which I have proposed, especially on the instructional side.

It is my hope that, using the computer and not misusing it, one can go to procedures such as the one I developed eight years ago on an observational program, something like the pupil watching of Henry Dyer's that was mentioned by Dr. Senior, which was a personal and social development program.

Now, this is not multiple choice, this is recording and classifying specific things which the student did which have an important bearing on his personal development, and I think that using the computer, this kind of thing, which got to be too much paper work and too complicated for our present generation of teachers to use, could be efficiently and well used. So that I think that the computer does a lot of opening up possibilities other than simple multiple-choice tests, and that the whole thing is a mess if one uses it like the Regents, and so forth, have been used,-or I am afraid as some of these other examinations being set--external examinations in England and so forth, unless one evaluates all objective tests and therefore points the teacher and student toward all objectives, the whole measurement can be used as a very bad tool instead of a good one.

Elizabeth Greenfield: Dr. Flanagan, could I ask you a question in relation to the critical incident proposal that you made? Given the kind of concern about teacher attitude which has been expressed in this meeting and, I think, pretty well documented, how can you remove the failures that already exist in the teacher-pupil relationship when you have the teacher deciding which are the 45 effective behaviors and which are the 45 that are not effective for the children?

It seems to me to have an inherent danger of pegging pupil performance at a teacher's appraisal, which we are very cautious about, and as a matter of fact, actually afraid of.

Martin Trow: It's not just a teacher's appraisal; it's a sort of lowest common denominator on which a lot of teachers can agree.

I think if I am concerned with this kind of relentless coordination it's because the quality of mind that can use the word"ineffective" when "disapproved" is meant causes me a great deal of uneasiness. It's precisely people who can't say "I don't like this," but have got to say, "This is ineffective," when it's clearly not ineffective in the precise sense of the word "ineffective."

I think the illustrations you cite I find illuminating as to the implications, the general consequences of this kind of conception of specification of educational goals. The children that I know and like most rarely handle teasing in an unruffled manner. They quite often don't carry out assigned tasks without a reminder. They have trouble in giving up something to help another. They are just a lot more complicated than these flattened-out, two-dimensional cardboard figures are, as you describe them.

I think that even the teachers are better than you give them credit for. I think it would be harder for them to be better than you give them credit for if they have this enormous machinery of normative apparatus telling them how they ought to be responding to themselves and to the children.

I think it's the substance of what you are saying that makes me most wary about the forms it takes.

Judson Shaplin: I wanted to give Dr. Flanagan perhaps a chance to answer, because there is a context of the conference which is really the base of the criticism here.

Let me say: suppose we had a school in which certain conditions were met coming from the conference. In this school we had teachers who, on the whole, were humane to children, who liked kids. On the whole we had teachers who had some skill in diagnosis of individual differences, a real appreciation of this, and we had available some specialists, in Dr. Kirk's sense, for the diagnosis and remediation of developmental deficiencies. Suppose we had those conditions and suppose we had an organization of that school such that the two bad teachers to one good teacher were so organized that the good teacher had some control over what happened in the classrooms. Can you tell us how the kind of computer technology and goal-directed instruction can fit this situation? Can you visualize that in a school upwards of 700 or a thousand kids, to be realistic, in the city?

Flanagan: Well, I think that this would fit the situation by the students having, in small groups or an individuals working on particular units--let's say it's the primary grades, they are using a particular reader. Now, in a class that I am talking about, there wouldn't ever be a situation where every fifth grade student has a reader that he cannot read. Every student would have a reader he could read and was the one that was best suited to his developed language ability.

Now, he probably would have some other students who were reading in a similar book. But in this situation he would be moving ahead at his own rate, and instead, as he does nowadays in many schools, of keeping a little record of what he is doing and how well he did on this little test, this would be going into a computer at various stages, as to how well he has progressed thus far, and this would be fed back to him and to the teacher and the next steps would be moved from there.

Shaplin: Can we visualize the input retrieval system for this computer in the school?

Flanagan: Yes. You have a typewriter and you have a mark sensing or else a punch-card type of reader, and this information is fed in by a clerk after checking the teacher's marks and other inputs, and it is fed into the system and the computer stores it.

Shaplin: How often does this happen?

Flanagan: Well, this would happen, let's say, in reading probably not more than every couple of weeks. But in other subjects and other activities there would be much more frequent inputs.

Shaplin: What is the resource center where the materials come from that the kids' work look like?

Flanagan: The resource center is a computer memory file with, let's say, at the first grade all the potential kinds of books and materials listed, with information on just what kind of students they are appropriate for.

Shaplin: What's the teacher looking at when they are trying to decide this individual child's retrieval problem? And how intimately connected is the teacher with this process?

Flanagan: Well, the teacher gets this back from the computer in terms of the plan that you have this student on is O.K. or it's not O.K.; that this student is progressing as we expected and is going right on to what we had planned for him or he is not; he's run into troubles and the teacher better find out what kinds of troubles.

Shaplin: That's sort of the final question. What kind of relationship does the teacher have with the students in this diagnosis of trouble with the computer packageing?

Flanagan: The teacher becomes, in my view, much more of a tutor to work with this student on his problem and plan his work with him.

Shaplin; How many can she handle?

Flanagan: Well, it was hoped that they can handle something like the traditional 30. The whole notion of this is that is will not require a tutor for each student, and so on, but rather with the aid of the computer, the teacher can become more nearly a tutor to 30 students.

Shaplin: How far along are we in the technology of the programming of instruction that permits this to become possible?

Flanagan: Well, I would say that this in its rudiments could be put in next fall, and the very important feature, as I see it, of this plan is that is does not wait for programmed learning, a lot of other things. You can start with the books you have, with the materials that you have right now, and we would have to add some tests, but that's the biggest thing. And by adding some tests to the materials we have now, it could be started right awawy and not as for the micro-programming teaching machine kind. This is many, many years off.

Greenfield: How would you handle the pupil's ability in spoken French? How would you test that? You talked about the number of words he would know at a given time in grammar, and so forth, but what would you do about this ability to speak the language? How would you judge that by the computer?

Flanagan: Well, I think that listening comprehension is fairly easy. We can use language laboratory kinds of things to get listening comprehension.

Speaking comprehension is more difficult, but the Educational Testing Service has developed some tests along this line. They are a little more subjective and they would be something which the teacher would be more involved in.

I don't think we necessarily have to talk about an automated kind of listening comprehension thing. This is somethingthe language people might want to work on, but I think that we are quite O.K. in the situation where we could have the teacher make a rating of how good he is speaking, whether she understands him, whether she undertands him under various kinds of circumstances, reading certain kinds of materials or speaking certain things.

Kirk: This discussion in a way reminds me that the Communist Party of the USSR in 1937 outlawed the use of I.Q. tests. They threw out all the pedologists, these are the school psychologists, out of the school because the pedologists were giving these I,Q. tests and it was just a capitalistic trick, discriminating against the working class because they scored lowed on these I.Q. tests.

We seem to be doing the same thing here. We want to throw out the baby with the bath-water because of what I would consider the misuse of tests, rather than whether these tests are any good.

I think you mentioned that you were barring the group I.Q. tests, not the individual I.Q. test, which I think is very sensible, because the reliability of those, the validity of those with certain types of children is very poor. They never were made to be used that way, and that decisions on children be used through group I.Q. tests, as we are using them.

I think what we have to stick by is some sort of analysis of the child. When you go into a physician's office and tell him you are sick, he puts a thermometer in your mouth and he finds out you have a one-degree fever. That's not a diagnosis, that's not an assissment. He then asks the question of why do you have the temperature, then he proceeds to give a series of medical tests, X-ray, blood, what have you, in attempting to find out the reason for the temperature. Then he proceeds to do something about that particular thing, or he takes a culture and he finds the drug that knocks off that particular germ.

I think where we've failed in school examinations, is that we have used a temperature reading that in a sense is very unreliable and we've pigeon-holed these children according to this test.

But I would hate to see us just throw the baby out with the bath-water, as Miriam Goldberg said, because one procedure is wrong.

I think if we had the means and the procedures, computer or otherwise, of tracing the reasons and organizing the program as Flanagan suggested--I'm mot so sure we can do that too well yet--computer or otherwise, then I think we can improve our education.

And I wonder whether when Mr. Mayer says that he was very much against these procedures, I wonder if he is against the procedure of analyzing the child step by step until you find out what he really needs.

Greenfield: Are you saying, Dr. Kirk, that you think Dr. Flanagan's proposal, if we were ready to implement it, is a good one? Is this the burden of your--

Kirk: I would say that if we can really do it in the way he says, it would be an aid; it wouldn't solve all of our problems.

Mayer: It is inherently abusive.

Melvin Tumin: You are not going far enough, Martin. You are not saying what you would do because of the inherent abusiveness.

Mayer: I think it can be controlled. I think it can be made useful. I didn't say throw it all out, but if this is where it goes, I say throw it all out. If you give me a choice of nothing or this, I say throw it all out and do it instantly, do lit as fast as you can.

Tumin: We have a third alternative. We are being extremely sociologically naive in considering the possible alternative technologies and instrumentation of educational processes without considering the context within which this is operating, the context consisting of teachers, parents and a college-oriented school system.

When Martin says the testing instrumentation is inherently abusive, I think he is absolutely right, given the following circimstances, which seem to prevail today: that, first, the size of classes which teachers have to deal with require that they stereoty e students into bundles inorder to deal with them more conveniently. And the best way to put them into bundles,-so they make believe there are three children in the class rather than 30,-is to group them: high, medium and low--by some form of standard testing. And that's where they remain until something is done about making it possible to individuate the relationship between the teacher and the student; that the teacher is going to search and find some method for clumping her students into so-called treatable homogeneous groups, no matter what, if we provide her with any such instruments.

And that's why I say you are not going far enough if you are not willing to throw out the entire baby. That's one.

There is a second condition which seems to me makes any use of testing instruments inherently abusive, and that is that they developed in a circumstance, if I understand the process correctly, in which it was assumed that competitive invidious grading was a form of inducing motivation on the one hand and a form of allocationg rewards in the system differentially to students on the curious notion that if students have different talents, they ought to be differently rewarded. That seemed to have nothing to do with the educational process as we are now conceiving its goals.

And so long as teachers inherit the idea of competitive invidious grading for purposes either of reward or of motivation neither of which seem by any research literature that I know to work, that long will we continue to abuse any testing instrument that we turn over to teachers in the form of standard grading.

Then there is a third thing, and that comes to the superintendents. We abuse the teachers, But the good Lord knows that the teachers are, themselves, prey to a system which consistently urges them or forces them to prepare certain echelons of students on the vasis of differential achievement for advanced education. We have not yet devised a system whereby we can allocate students for differential rates of progress without at the same time abusing, demotivating and degrading the large masses of students.

I think in this context superintendents and principals are far more at fault than the teachers, to the extent that many teachers would be quite willing to operate by some better standards of relating to children than they feel free to do. But they say: if I say to my principal I don't want to grade students A, B, C and D, he says you must. And if the principal says: I don't want to grade my students this way, the superintendent says you must. And they say you must because the parents want their kids to be prepared to go on to Ivy League colleges.

Now, if we continue to orient the school system primarily to the differential selection for advanced education, and if we continue to rely on an antiquated and completely wrong notion of differential motivation and rewarding as a basis for conducting an adequate school system, and if we insist on loading teachers down with a burden so that it is impjossible to relate individually to children, any standard testing is going to be abused in the school, given the uses to which it is now put, as against alternatives which we could devise, I think, without any serious problem.

By serious problems I mean any problem that isn't inherently unworable, because I think there are workable problems though they are terribly difficult. I would say throw the entire baby out. I can't see a good valid use within this context that can be controlled for differential evalution of students on the basis of standard tests.

Ernest van den Haag: I think Mr. Mayer made a perfectly reasonable remark, but I think Mr. Tumin perverted it. The reasonable remark is that the diagnosic tests which Mr. Mayer's neighbor, Mr. Dyer, spoke about, served probably no very useful purpose and are very easily perverted, except where there is special justification. It is a test not of achievement but of potentiality which then leads teachers to grade against the potentiality in the case that we were told about and leads children to be branded in terms of their supposed potentiality and so on.

I don't even see why a teacher needs to know that, if it could be known.

Let me just point out that I have some personal experience and I first was put into a public school. I apparently did very badly and I did have modern parents that did have me tested. The result was that I should have been in a school for retarded children. For some reason, my mother wasn't quite that modern and did not accept it, and you will have to judge whether this was right or wrong. I an not sure. I never figured it out.

But an any rate, this leads me to be somewhat skeptical of the testing of potential. But, on the other hand, it seems Mr. Tumin is giving us a counsel of impossible perfection when he seems to indicate that we can simply do without testing achievement. There must be some system of selection for a variety of reasons.

And, also, I an not at all convinced that as a system of rewards and incentives this does not work.

The point that Mr. Tumin seems to have forgotten, and it is a sociological problem, is he is against what he calls invidious competition. Well, if it is invidious, I certainly an againsy it, too, as who would not be. But he does seem to fail to grasp that if the competition is not in terms of grading according to intellectual standards, which we hope could be good, then it eill still take place according to some other standard which may be considerably worse. Indeed, this is what has happened very largely in the past in the American high schools, And it seems to me that Mr. Tumin's proposal is directly reactionary.

Herman Long: I wouldn't argue whether or not tests should be thrown out. I still think there is a lot of value in them, but this is not the point of what I want to say.

What I want to say is essentially, whether you are talking about achievement tests or intelligence tests, I think the biggest deficiency is that when it comes back to the teacher it does not help the teacher to teach better to meet the deficiencies that the tests have measured. What the teacher gets is either a classification of a student in regard to some national or state or regional standard, or he may be fortunate enough to get a profile of a student. Actually the profile doesn't help the teacher, either ,because the profile is a man-to-man measure.

What is seems to me we ought to be aiming at is not the specificity that would come from individual analyses--that might be helpful--but I think what we need more than that, perhaps as a step toward it, are the patterns of failure within there instruments that can be fed back to the teacher as ameans of meeting needs that go beyond the individual but still, at the same time, meet these individual needs and deficiencies. I think this is the primary dimension that I see. If we can do this, then it seems to me we can address ourselves to the concern of the minority groups or the dispossessed groups.

It doesn't matter to me, it doesn't make any difference to me, it's not significant to me whether a Negro scores on the average one, two or three grades below the national average in reading or mathematics, and it doesn't really help me if I am going to have to deal with these students or other students.

It does help me an awful lot if I knew what, withiin the range of items, within the range of concept, within the range of even informations and subject matters within this instrument that you have arrived at a score within which you can classify Negroes or Puerto Ricans--what within it meaningfully can be attacked by the teacher or which will release the potential of the student and the kind of responses which we need in the intellectual process.

JosEph Monserrat: As a non-expert in the roomful of experts, I am goint to dard speak from the arrogance of ignorance.

One of the things that concerns me very much about some of our discussion around testing I might try for a moment to connect up iwth some of the physical science findings and methodology which we try to emulate, but some of the problems we refuse fo face up--and I want to use the Puerto Rican as an example.

I can agree that a Binet test is a test that is a measurement, but the use of this measurement is as a diagnostic situation. And I think that if a biologist or a chemist were to come out and produce a product that cured warts but gave one ulcers, that this product would not be used until it was regined.

And I believe that in our social sciences we are using unrefined methodology; that is, we are using metholdology which is only partly refined and refuse to recognize the side-effect which may be, and in fact is, worse than some of the things that is is not curing. And I think that maybe one of the things we ought to be concerned with is as behavioral scientists whose tools are being constantly used and misused, I don't think we can get away from the responsibility that we have of the use of the instruments that we are preparing.

Let me give you one example. If I were to believe what is said about the Puerto Rican child in the New York City School System, then I know this kid, according to the concepts of culturally-deprived, according to concepts of disadvantaged et. cetera, is doomed to failure. But then I happen to have the good fortune of being able to return to Puerto Rico quite frequently, and there I see the Puerto Rican society in which these same kids or the brothers and sisters of these same kids are creating a society which is one of the fastest-moving societies in the world, in which the teachers and the psychologists and the professors and the educators and the criminals and the judges and the legislorots are all Puerto Rican, all achieving within a totality of a communtity.

And then I come back to New York and I find that these same kids, according to what we are doing in terms of behavioral science testing, these kids aren't going to get anywhere.

I wonder whether or not we can have a conference sponsored by the Roger Williams Straus Council on Human Relations, speak about equality in education and speak in Fabian ideational terms, which is what I think we are doing here, rather than in some of the realities, for example, which I think Dr. Taylor's paper mentioned in the beginning.

What are we going to do about taking the first step toward equality? What are we doing about eliminating the two existing school systems that we are really talking about, the two differentiated goal and goal-motivated school systems, and try to at least start to make it one before we can go into the more perfected forms that we are discussing.

So to me I think that there is--and we have a responsibility of not just saying: yes, we know that the misuse of our tools could be harmful, that our tools are not meant to be used this way, but whether they are meant to be used this way or not, we cannot escape the reality of the use to which they are put. And therefore it would seem to me that we have a responsibility to either perfect this thing so that as it is used it us used properly, as we would with a medicine, or make sure its use is limited to the point where it can't be misused. And I think what we are doing is creating in a society which either permits us or not permits us to do and to develop the kind of educational system we want.

Some of the reasons why they will and won't permit it are precisely because we have given them a value which a group feels that they must contain for themselves and don't want for the others.

Then I ould like to point out one other thing, just one other thing, and, mercy, yes, one other thing-- the teachers, and a good numver of the teachers who in education departments are teaching in New York City were just yesterday the disadvantaged and the culturally deprived of the slums of the city. And I don't know where, when we do measure them we are--for example, measuring the effect of a second generation teacher who, herself, is still in the process of acculturation pershps, what the reaction of seeing a mirror of themselves in their own background presented to them in the classroom every day when youngsters go through this process through which they went through just some time ago reflects in their own memory.

And so I say--and I repeat--there are some questions here and some big doubts which, since I am not an expert I don't know that they can't be done, and I suppose it's in Puerto Rico we are not experts, we don't know it can't be done, but we seem to be going ahead and doing it.

Seymour Harris: I think there is a prejudice against economists, and since I am the only economist, I do want to say something about this prol'em.

I started my teaching career here in Princeton in 1920. As I look around at the boys at Princeton today and compare them with the boys that were here in 1920, I can tell you this is a tribute to the aptitude tests. I have noticed exactly the same thing at Harvard. I have had almost a 50-year experience at Harvard, 45 years of teaching, 43 teaching and two years here and as an undergraduate. And the difference in the Harvard student today and the Harvard student or the kind of boy selected for Harvard in the days when I was a freshman at Harvard, that difference is largely explained by these aptitude tests.

The point I want to make is that for years Harvard, for example has what they call a predictive rank list. This is based on what the student shows in his tests, aptitude tests, what is revealed by his high school record or private shhool record, and this record in part does suggest motivation, the sort of thing that Mr. Mayer suggested, an energy test. And what the principal and the teachers say also suggests motivation. You take all this record and on the basis of this the university tried to predict what a man is going to do in his four years of college. The correlations are remarkably high.

I think the thing to do is to teach the teachers what these tests really mean, and I am perfectly willing to admit there are all kinds of abuses.

Let me indicate just one factual thing here. We have learned from some studies made by the National Science Foundation thzt of every hundred students that start in college in mathematics, only 20% ever finish in mathematics. This suggests to me--and here I agree with what Mr. Flanagan says--that we do have to use certain kinds of tests. But even at Harvard--what actually happens is, that you start with about 45% in the sciences and mathematics when they start their college career and give their intentions, and you end up with only 20% in the sciences and mathematics.

Kirk: That's due to poor instruction.

Harris: It may probably be poor instruction, but it's also probably poor choice, too.

But now you go to the humanities, they start with 35 and they end up with 35. And then you go to social sciences and every social scientist here knows we start with 20 and we end up with 45. They get all the second-rate people from the sciences. They never should have been in the sciences.

So all I am trying to say is that I think that the hostility to tests has been overdone.

Taylor: I am delighted to say in support of Mel Tumin and Mr. Monserrat, whose comments I found even more illuminating than some of the others, that at Sarah Lawrence I found at no point any particular need for the kind of standardized tests which are in general used in other colleges as selective instruments and as a grading device. They were not much good to us in selecting the students, because we found other ways. They were no damn good to us in teaching our students, because they didn't test anything that we were interested in knowing about.

van den Haag: How many teachers were there per student?

Taylor: Let me finish this sentence, then I'll give you one of your own.

As we went through various other ways of teaching and learning, we used field work, we used participation in the arts, we used students teaching each other, we did many of the things which have been suggested here which can be used on a national scale.

I am forced to extend my remarks beyond ten seconds. The ratio at Sarah Lawrence of teachers to students is eight to one, which is a larger number of students per teacher than is at Harvard or Vassar or most of the eastern colleges. The kind of philosophy and approach will work, I know, in rations running from fifteen to one and twenty to one, It depends what you do with the teacher's time. If you want to use the kind of mechanical apparatus, you can use it, but I don't think it's particularly useful for the kind of ends which we sought at Sarah Lawrence.

And I think there are ways of having your juniors and seniors work with freshmen, developing through tutorial sessions new ways of teaching in different kinds of groupings, and you do what Urie Bronfenbrenner was talking about yesterday, you build the learning into the teaching, and everyone is teaching in the total community situation in which they take a sense of responsibility for other students.

And students themselves, if you want to have some marks and grading of each other, they will grade each other and read each other's papers and talk about them together. There is no notion in this philosophy that it's necessary always to have a teacher, Give a guy something and then two weeks later test him.

I couldn't understand, Mr. Flanagan, why, in response to Jud's question, ylu needed this apparatus at all. If you had the kind of situation Jud set up for you, why would you, every two weeks, tuck this stuff in a computer and get it back? I don't really think that it's going to help you much. I don't think you should know that much about your students as they go along; it's none of your damn business. And I think we need to leave them alone and then, every year or so, take a look at them. But in the meantime let's encourage them to grow instead of keeping on poking at them.

SESSION FIVE

Theme: THE CONTENT AND PROCESSES OF EDUCATION

Introduction	**JAMES GALLAGHER**	**i - v**
Theme Paper and Supplementary Comments	**EDGAR Z. FRIEDENBERG**	**1 - 28 c**
Discussion	**MIRIAM GOLDBERG**	**29 - 35**
Discussion	**SAMUEL SHEPARD, JR.**	**36 - 41**
Response	**EDGAR Z. FRIEDENBERG**	**42 - 44**
Additional Queries and Responses		**45 - 55**

INTRODUCTION

by

James Gallagher

I have been trying to take advantage of the fact that this is one of the later sessions by studying the role of moderator, and I have come to the conclusion that although I am not very skilled in role theory the role of the moderator is rather a neutral position and somewhat like that of an announcer at a hanging. On one hand, he doesn't get the thrill of pulling the trap-door, but on the other hand, he doesn't have rope-burns on his neck. And he has the additional advantage of being able to make a few announcements before the event takes place.

In terms of looking at the conference as a whole and as a generator of productive ideas, I'd like to mention something regarding work on productive thinking and work on creative thinking.

One of the things that seems to be the most effective inhibitor of creative ideas is what I call instant evaluation; that is, to take an unformed idea or partially-formed idea and apply to it the full range of critical faculties that one can produce. We've all had lots of practice on graduate students and I think that in a large sense we have lost a lot of the productive potential of our students and of our colleagues. What I am asking for, therefore, is suspension of evaluation and the consideration of what might be the possible aspects of the ideas that could possibly be put into action.

Now, unless the ideas we have talked about have an impact on differential content and differential process, then what we have really had here is indeed an academic exercise. The concept of student diversity has been honored more in educational theory than in educational action. Most of my original thoughts were pre-empted by a large number of people -- Martin Deutsch is a prime offender in this regard. So I am not going to go through them, but I do feel I ought to mention a couple of things.

One is that since our knowledge of the range of individual differences has been with us for such a long period of time, it might pay us to consider what the cost is of taking this into account in an educational problem. Obviously, the cost is very large; otherwise we would be doing it. Part of the cost is money. Part, also, is the attitude that it's really more efficient to run the school system with a single textbook, with an immutable curriculum, with a reading list of a limited series of books. It's really more efficient from a businesslike standpoint.

We have accepted the point of view, I think, that a messy classroom many times shows productive and creative activities. The very neat, very orderly classroom, in which there are very great amounts of silence, and in which the students are attentive and waiting for the teacher to act, may really not be the most productive environment for the development of ideas.

I don't think, however, that we have accepted this concept as relevant at the administrative level as well, namely, that to have a creative school system you also have to have sloppiness, and you also have to have a great many things going on which are not neat and do not fit into the traditional businessman's idea of what efficiency really is.

Even when strong forces resulted in some modification of curriculum and method, these changes were made very grudgingly. With the mentally retarded, we had the watered-down curriculum, which means we changed it, but not much. With the gifted student, we had a nebulous and often non-existent adjustment called "enrichment". And I think the cost of administrative confusion, together with the lack of knowledge of how to do this, has played a large role in keeping the school program as homogeneous as it is.

In educational research, much of the emphasis has been on product. The major complaint about tests at this Conference has been the fact that testing has been used in a product sense rather than a process sense; that if tests are to be used, they should be used in a diagnostic fashion. Dr. Long mentioned this morning that if you analyze the errors of the students, you are more able to plan a program which is differentially applied to his particular needs and problems. If, however, you use tests merely as predictive devices you are perhaps right in dispensing with those kinds of tests.

There is a great deal of sophisticated scapegoating of the teacher. Teachers are ideal scapegoats. They are somewhat intra-punitive, anyhow, and they are more than ready to accept blame for anything that you want to lay on them.

Having worked for five years in trying to analyze classroom interaction, I have developed a great respect for the journeyman teachers in the classroom and how effective they can be, particularly when we have not really trained them what to teach, nor have we given them a really good content background, nor have we really taught them how to teach in terms of an analysis of the process of teaching and the process of learning.

I think the comments on research are correct, in the sense that if the research person is a hit-and-run artist, who comes into the school system on a one-shot basis, and then goes out again, perhaps this is not much good. Perhaps the basis of educational research should really be that the research person should be in the learning situation and should be trying to study the process of education.

We have found, in working with teachers, that if we try to give them a structure by which they can understand the kinds of questions that they ask, and the varying impact on the students, and that what they can expect from the students depends upon the types and styles of questions that are asked, then the teachers acquire a sense of control over the classroom that they did not have before.

A lot of people have said teachers hate kids. A lot of teachers do hate kids. In this respect, teachers are like anybody else -- they hate people who show up deficiencies in their own performance. If we teach the teachers how to control the performance and how to do a job which they consider effective, they will feel much more kindly towards the youngsters.

We talk about teacher behavior, but we don't talk about teacher strategy. We identify two teacher strategies. One is: I have the result; I will dispense it in limited doses because of the limited time that I have; and therefore the student strategy is obvious. The reciprocal student strategy is that he waits and listens carefully to get down exactly what the teacher says, because this is the truth, and he knows it's the truth, because this is what's going to show up on the examination that the teacher gives, not necessarily the standardized examination, but the examination that the teacher made up herself.

Another strategy is: the truth is yet to be determined; I have some ways that I can help you to find out what it is; I have been around a little longer than you, so I know a little bit more, but let's join and hunt together. The student strategy that is the response to this teacher's strategy is quite a bit different. It frees the student to go out and think for himself and try to obtain solutions to the problems, rather than wait for the teacher to give him to truth, because if the teacher has the truth, why should the student wait and strain to find out what it is?

It is interesting to me that throughout this conference we have not had an awful lot of talk about one of the most significant movements in education, which was the New Curriculum Project marked by Bruner's book, "The Process of Education," the National Science Foundation Project and the U.S. office of Education Curriculum Project. These make a very distinct break with the traditional development of curriculum by educators at the state and the local levels. What we have now is a national level of planning, whether you like it or not, and a combination of the talents of educators and curriculum specialists to produce in concert a curriculum that will teach the basic structure or the conceptual foundations of the content field. At least that is the goal. Whether this curriculum is indeed appropriate for all of the children, or just some of the children in the school system, is a very good question; and whether we should have curriculum projects that are applicable to other groups of children is also a very good question.

Not only, however, is the content modified in these curriculum projects, but they are employing a different style. In many of the curriculum projects we've had an emphasis on the use of discovery-method, and a stimulation of students to develop skills of inquiry and investigation, as well as to learn the content. The development of the intellectually-autonomous student has been an important stated goal for educators. At the same time, we should talk about the risk and cost of this, because there is a cost in the intellectually-autonomous student. The obvious one is that he may come up with conclusions that are different from those of the teacher. Another is that it makes for a messy classroom and it makes for a messy business. It takes much longer to let the students develop ideas on their own or to try to solve problems on their own. I don't mean just the problems to which you have pre-digested answers.

The new interest in creativity appears fruitful in the sense that it redirects the attention of the educator to the process of thinking of the student. When you start talking about creativity you can hardly avoid the questions of what is the process; what are the stages; what are the steps that the student goes through in order to attain this product.

I think, also, that there hasn't been sufficient consideration of two different kinds of questions here. One is: can you do something? The other is: should you do something? I think they all get mixed up in the things we have been discussing.

For example, we can ask the question of the research person: can we change youngsters who have lower-class values into youngsters who have middle-class values? That is a researchable question and one that can be attacked.

There is another question, and that is: should you do it? And in this regard the research person has only one vote, just like anybody else, in terms of what his basic value structures are and what the good life is and what values should be.

Can you intervene in the family life of the individual so as to create change in the child? Should you intervene in the family life to create change in the child? These are two differences.

We were given a choice at one time of strong intervention versus weak intervention. How could one be for weak intervention? One of the synonyms for intervention is "manipulation". I think we ought to consider what the values are that are involved in this sort of situation.

SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS
by
Edgar Z. Friedenberg

There are several introductory points that I want to make.

The first has to do with a refinement of the use of middle-class values which was brought to my mind by Harold Taylor's usurpation of a comment that had emerged jointly. from our thinking in discussing this informally earlier.

"Middle-class values" is used, I think, incorrectly. I think I've used it incorrectly simply because I didn't know any shorter way of referring to the emerging present complex or what George Spindler calls emerging values with the bureaucratic adjustive what, to be polite and neutral, we might call homeostatic orientation toward one's life situation. This is not, of course, what the middle-class used to be known for and I, too, am very much in favor of people paying their debts and knowing where they live and what they stand for and being trustworthy in their undertakings as well as capable of self-discipline and focus in a cooperative enterprise. Since Mr. Rossi made it clear that I had not actually succeeded in showing how these, among other values, would be recognized, I didn't know the kind of person that I had in mind. I think I do, although I certainly don't know where to find him.

There are, I think, three basic assumptions in my paper which are distinctly in contradiction to what has seemed to me to be the emerging tonus of thinking of much of the Conference and which, indeed, I had supposed would be at the time that I wrote it.

The first of these has to do with the relative value ranking of the functions of a school. I do not value chiefly the use of the school as a social instrument and therefore I do not value chiefly the use of the school for the redress of social grievances or for the equalization of opportunity.

I place first among the values to which education contributes -- though I place a positive value on each of those I have just dismissed -- its use in elucidating where you are in your own position in life and the meaning of your experience, what you have to deal with. And whether this is a position in poverty and cultural deprivation or a position in affluence, it is equally complex, more complex, if anything, when you have less to work with and are more oppressed. And therefore it seems to me futile to talk about any less-exacting form of education, or to suppose that the requirements of reality can be waived. The worse off you are, the more essential it is that you think hard about your position and that you use all of the intellectual tools and resources of the past in order to do it; and if you can't, you can't. But the plight is worse rather than better and the demands are greater.

The second point has to do with how education experiences in the school and in life outside it and in some cases prior to it are to be hooked up and connected. I do not think that there is a qualitative difference between these two sorts of experience. That being so, it would follow that education will be most effective to the extent, all other things being equal, that all of the communication that gets packed into it between peers, between students and teachers and between what happens to the student in school and what has happened to him elsewhere, should be codable within congruent categories of thought and should have at least a basically similar frame of reference. For that reason I suspect that class-selective education is almost always a good deal richer in the meaning of what is there -- it is poorer in leaving out certain things -- than heterogeneous education, just as this Conference itself suffers, not from a variety of points of view but from so much heterogeneity of role that you get an effect of having to cram things together, get statements in that don't go together.

Therefore I am perfectly willing to accept a certain amount of class leveling with the acknowledgment that this cuts down on the effectiveness of the school in promoting equality of opportunity, as the price of dealing with people in a situation in which what they do with one another, each unit, means more. For this reason, although I don't think his interpretation of the facts can be questioned, I would be opposed in my evaluation of Prof. Harris's observation about the change in Princeton and Harvard. I am certain that it has been in the direction that he says. I am certain that the tests have helped move it in that way. I am not at all certain that it is better either for the kids who do come or for the society as a whole, since I think that a Harvard or a Princeton which acts as a repository and a place of elaboration of certain rather fixed social values is desperately needed in a society of this sort. Whether it's better for the students who otherwise wouldn't have come seems to me to be an untestable question for the reason that they have made Harvard and Princeton something else by virtue of their presence or at least of their dominance, so what was here before has therefore just disappeared or at least been so sharply modified that it isn't the same.

The third point has to do, of course, with this question of helping and of the assumption that interventions, if believed to be helpful on the basis of the values of those who intervene, can be justified; and this is, of course, one of the points, that perhaps need not be justified.

To some extent a number of the proposals that are before us in dealing with the culturally-deprived today frankly seem to me like ambulance-chasing. Nobody doubts that there has been severe injury to the culturally-deprived, that there is culpable negligence involved in the injury and that the litigation has already begun. What I am questioning is whether all of those who propose to intervene are in fact counsel, and have been retained, or would willingly be retained by those whom they would here claim to represent.

I felt when Dr. Redl commented that Dr. Kirk has been disrespectful of the clinical complexity, I had a little bit of an oopsey feeling, since I have come to expect and always to get so much from Dr. Redl, because it seemed to me that what was being treated disrespectfully was not the clinical complexity but the integument in which the clinical complexity resides; that is, the kid himself. The real difficulty is in setting about to help people, I do not refer so much to reading, because that is a part of our acknowledged educational responsibility. Mistakes in that are like mistakes on the operating table: they may be fatal but they are not intrusive. But when we then go on to his fingernails and ultimately to his character, we are raising a very serious question of civil liberty and respect for human dignity.

DISCUSSION

by
Miriam Goldberg

Dr. Friedenberg says that "close, hard analysis and synthesis, and personal response to symbolic material are among the fundamental functions of a school." And this I can only applaud. I applaud his staunch determination to guard this function of the school for the minority who benefit by it and his determination to retain or introduce into the curriculum for lower status students the "close, hard, symbolic analysis", even when this would require them to use "intellectual processes and techniques that they find troublesome."

Unfortunately, the paper gives no clue to the substance of the symbolic material to be taught, nor does it indicate whether the content is to be the same for all pupils, with variations only in the "personal response" aspect, or whether the actual substance should differ according to some criteria of pupil ability, concern, or special need. Further, the paper tells us little in terms of process, of how we might reach the very people for whom it is so important to investigate the symbolic processes and perhaps, in Dr. Friedenberg's term, needed most.

One thing is clear: Dr. Friedenberg would like to see a curriculum which not only allows for, but actively encourages, individuality and the development of a wide range of talents and personal styles. He decries the emphasis on producing "well rounded" individuals whose utterances he likens so graphically to the "ou-boum" of the Marabar Cave. And here, too, I can't but feel in complete sympathy with his goals and purposes.

He views the various guidance services of the school, however, as an invasion of privacy, geared toward "adjusting" pupils to group norms, sanding down the rough edges of individuality and, along with the common curriculum, acting as a leveler, to produce a common mediocrity.

I'd like to comment here that perhaps the problems with the guidance services are in the very nature of their adjustive enterprise. Let me compliment this entire body, if I may, on not having used the word "adjustment" once in the context of this conference. And for this I think we all should be congratulated. It is a word that, I think, fortunately we have thrown out of our educational vocabulary. But perhaps some of these services, along with the test interpreters or servers, tend to make of this helping function an adjusting function. If this is Dr. Friedenberg's objection, I too would very strongly support the need for change.

It is therefore difficult to disagree with the educational goals implicit in Dr. Friedenberg's critique of the American high school. But, unfortunately, the goals are not translated into operational terms. While the criticisms are specific, supported by examples from literature and from the writer's own study of high school students, the processes by which the criticism may be met and desirable changes brought about, at least in the context of the public schools, are never mentioned. The only positive suggestions in the paper are contained in the proposal for a new federally-supported institution for the so-called disadvantaged youth.

One is, therefore, led to conclude -- perhaps wrongly -- that Dr. Friedenberg has written off the public schools as even potentially meaningful educational institutions by his light of what a meaningful educational institution may be. He sees it as too firmly bound by the forces of egalitarianism, on the one hand, and of the economic market place, on the other, to allow for the development of individual independence, excellence, and, above all, diversity.

It seems to me that Dr. Friedenberg errs on two counts, in a sense, on both sides of this coin. First of all, he attributes more power to the high school as a shaper of student values than the evidence supports. For example, from Prince's study in 1957 it appears quite clear that the values held by entering high school freshmen differ from one type of school to another, but they are almost identical to those held by the graduating seniors of each of these schools. It is not that the schools universally impose or even support a commonly-held set of values; it is rather that, for whatever reasons -- and this may be seen again as good or bad -- the high schools, at least, have been ineffectual in modifying the values with which students come.

On the other hand, he errs, it seems to me, in totally dismissing the change potential of the schools -- change in the direction which I think he himself would support. The last decade has witnessed very significant changes, both in content and in climate. In content, the changes have been in the direction of fostering greater independence of thought -- for some children, at least -- greater tolerance for ambiguity, greater skepticism, more room for original contributions as well as greater self-direction and increased opportunity for students, to quote from Dr. Friedenberg's paper, "go more deeply into the meaning of materials." It is true that these changes have been far more apparent in the sciences and mathematics than in the humanistic areas where they are, perhaps, more needed. But that, too, may come.

And the climate has changed in the direction of supporting individual excellence. Classes for gifted students, advanced placement courses, honors bestowed for academic and, in some schools, for artistic efforts as well, scholarships for outstanding ability -- all of these have, at least to some extent, unfrozen the egalitarian norms.

This is not to say that the school has now become the ideal place for the development of individuality and for the growth of diversity. But it does indicate that changes can and do take place, and that writing the schools off as hopeless derives from an unwarranted and, I feel, destructive pessimism.

What is perhaps more to the point is the possibility that in its recent concern for the least advantaged, the school may be forced back to an egalitarianism from which it has been slowly moving away. Because, under present circumstances, intellectual and academic excellence is more often found among the richer than the poorer and among the whites than among the Negroes, special concern for the more able is being attacked as discriminatory on socio-economic or racial grounds. And there is a danger, which I would share with Dr. Friedenberg, that instead of planning a school curriculum and organizing school services to unlock the potential talent in all groups, the least-advantaged as well as the most, even if this may take a generation to achieve in full measure, the schools will succumb to eliminating the existing diversity of curriculum, the concern for the more highly endowed individual, in order not to give visible support to racial or social segregation. But the solution to this problem does not lie, it seems to me, in the laissez-faire stance proposed by Dr. Friedenberg. Just allowing the lower class pupil to remain a marginal learner, unwilling and unable to address himself to the symbolic processes of which the paper speaks, hostile to the school, bound by a set of values at least as rigid -- and in many instances more rigid -- and far less viable in modern society than those supported by the middle-class and reflected in the school, seems to me to foster defeat and a sense of personal inadequacy rather than productive diversity.

It is important to distinguish, it seems to me, between two kinds of "blithe independence" in this group. The one kind, which is best described, I think, in Elizabeth Drews' notion of the creative intellectual, the person who opposes some aspects of the middle-class structure of the school, if you will, because of his bent for artistic creativity and intellectual values; and the one whom Elizabeth Drews calls the rebel, the one who perhaps, like your bathroom smoker, is a youngster with little direction in life, who is, in a sense, acting out his hostilities in the school, hostilities which may derive from the school or from other aspects of his environment. These are two different animals in our school structure, and I do believe they need different approaches.

Nor will Dr. Friedenberg's voluntary institution, it seems to me, provide the answer. Aside from requiring the construction of a parallel school system -- for even under hotel management, it would still be a school -- which, as it expanded, would fall prey to many of the same problems which now are here in our public schools, its voluntary nature would fail to reach the very group which most needs help. And the help need not mean an invasion of privacy or a stamping out of spontaneity and individuality. It is, essentially, help to acquire the skills, the knowledge which will enable them to achieve their own goals -- which, at the present time, I think, are essentially materialistic -- through legitimate channels and perhaps even open their eyes to the rich non-material possibilities of life.

So far, our schools have failed to bring large groups of students into the learning enterprise, even though they attend school for more or less years. The reasons are many, some of which Dr. Friedenberg alludes to. But one crucial aspect, both of the problem and the possible solution, he refers to only in passing. Because their pre-school experiences fail to develop the readiness for learning, the basic cognitive and language skills needed to succeed in the most basic learning enterprise - reading - many of these youngsters become school failures in the early grades and demonstrate what we have come to call "progressive retardation." It was Paul Goodman who pointed out that "the longer these kids stay in school, the dumber they get."

Although there are certainly ways of breaking into this cycle at many levels, the most obvious place to begin is at the beginning -- if we view first grade as a kind of arbitrary initial stage of schooling -- and this Dr. Friedenberg completely ignores. Perhaps it is the content and processes at the pre-school and elementary level that require first priority among our concerns. And here some beginnings have been made.

Once educators had the temerity to state openly that slum children -- despite Dr. Redl's objection to this term (I wish he would supply us with a better one) -- and ghetto children need a different educational approach, different content, different teaching strategies, materials and procedures began to emerge. We have only a bare beginning, and there is a great deal that needs to be learned about how to compensate for early deficiencies; how to present learning tasks to children, and yes, how to help them want to learn. If this is an intrusion on their privacy, so be it. For without this intrusion they will not learn to read and write, to deal with ideas or develop their talents. If we guard their privacy from intrusion by the school, it will remain a privacy of discouragement and defeat, of distorted self-image and self-rejection and be left wide open to the intrusion of the destructive forces which prey upon the marginal individual.

It is unfortunate -- and of this I think too many educators have been guilty -- that the epithet "middle class" has been applied indiscriminately to cover a multitude of loosely related and sometimes even contradictory values. Middle class values support belles lettres as well as Babbitry and give form not only to Main Street but also to Lincoln Center and the Museum of Modern Art, to Broadway and even to Bohemia. From this orientation come not only die-hard supporters of the status quo and their acquiescent colleagues in the professions, but also the innovators, the iconoclasts, the scientists and artists, and the social reformers.

As Dr. Friedenberg reminds us, although the content of much of our literature may deal with lower class problems and settings, the writers are of the middle class. In fact, Nancy Harris, so beautifully described as the young violinist, is no less a reflection of some middle class values than is Karen Clark, the well-rounded young girl who is to go see the king.

Perhaps, then, the aims of education should not be discussed in terms of strengthening the existing middle-class values of the suburbs or of foisting such values upon lower class pupils, and thus extending Main Street into the slums and ghettos. But they should be viewed, rather, in terms of bringing both to Harlem and to Main Street a broader vision of how, as producers and consumers, they can participate more actively in the life of ideas.

The greatest strength of Dr. Friedenberg's paper, it seems to me, is his insistence that the school provide for diversity and encourage uniqueness and outstandingness. I believe that this can be accomplished through something which will bear the same name as the one which Dr. Flanagan applied today but which in essence is different. As we desegregate schools I think we are making serious errors if we think for much longer in terms of education in the segregated school or the lower-class school or the slum school, because certainly within all our lifetimes we are going to see mixed schools. This fact alone, I think, will for the first time really alert teachers to the fact that they have had wide ranges of abilities in their classes all along but that these were masked by certain kinds of apparent homogeneity. The ranges weren't quite so great, the behaviors tended to be more or less comparable, and now, for the first time, they are going to have youngsters in their classes who don't fit into this pseudo-homogeneity, pseudo though it may be.

And I think that perhaps this will be the catalyst to push us into individualizing instruction in a real sense, not through the computer but through the efforts of organizing a classroom learning situation in which children with great ranges of ability, children with diverse interests and bents and talent can proceed with their education.

I'd like to cite a descriptive instance here, if I may. When he was in New York, Douglas Pidgeon of the National Foundation for Schedule Research in England and Wales, described some new mathematics material which has been developed by a gentleman called Mr. Deans, and he said: "When you get to England I'd like you to see their use, because they have a peculiar quality. It isn't only that they teach mathematics but in every classroom in which they have been used the teacher has been forced to individualize his mathematics teaching." The school can't afford to buy more than one set and the materials are such that children get to use them at different times in different ways.

So I went to look at the Deans material in a school in Leicester, and what I found there was not just Deans' material but a classroom of 47 children -- Lord help us and the teacher -- but 47, nonetheless, and one teacher, and every child in that room was working on some different aspect of learning. The room was, I guess, was Maria Montessori would have called a prepared environment. There were no machines in the room, no computers, perhaps some would have been of great help, but there was a wealth of material and they were ordered and organized so the children could come and take and work and put away and go on to the next learning contest. And in all this time the teacher was working with one child after another.

And beyond that, two boys who were working on algebra were sitting with a classmate whom they apparently liked a good deal and who said to me, "Gosh, you know, I'm just dumb in arithmetic. I'm all right, but I'm just dumb in arithmetic" -- very calmly -- and they were helping him with arithmetic, which was at about the fourth grade level in this class of sixth-graders.

There are many shortcomings in this class. There was little group participation. There was no language development of an oral kind, which certainly belonged there. But the fact that it was not perfect does not detract from its demonstration of the fact that you can organize a classroom in which children can move at their own rate, in which children can address themselves in different amounts of time to varying activities, depending on their own bent and concern.

We have been pretty well "burned" by attempts at grouping. I think Dr. Kirk made this very clear with his list of 35 plans. We just completed, about a year or so ago, a study on the effects of ability grouping and found that if you just group children by some measure such as IQ or reading--it seems to make little difference what academic measures you use--and then you expect some wonderful things to happen because you have narrowed the ability range in that classroom, you're doomed to disappointment.

From our study we found that the reverse was true: that, by and large, most of the kids in most subjects did best in the broadest range situation, partly because if there were bright kids there, the teacher was forced to teach science; and if there were slower kids there she put a little more time on some mathematics drill, so that arithmetic computation came out better for everybody.

The important issue is that grouping the children may achieve some of the ends that Dr. Redl is concerned about--bringing together groups of youngsters who, in various emotional and social ways, can be supported by each other, but I don't think that any scheme of grouping which we have devised so far is going to solve the problem of meeting some of the objections that Dr. Friedenberg has raised. This needs an individual approach.

And I would lik to both applaud Dr. Friedenberg's insistence on the importance of addressing ourselves to the full range of abilities in the classroom and deplore his, I think, implicit notion that the public schools cannot achieve this.

DISCUSSION
by
Samuel Shepard, Jr.

I would agree that segregated education cannot be equal education for the general reasons cited. I would emphasize, however, that one striking, unequal result of such education if the negative self-image which it helps to reinforce. This is the self-concept that must be corrected if Negro children are to make that "hard, close symbolic analysis and interpretation of their position in life" which you recommend as a general answer to the problem of cultural disadvantage.

Now, with regard to our "dine-out" program, I want to make it clear that this program is not an attempt to seduce the children into accepting middle-class morality. Rather, it is an attempt to help them develop a more positive self-image, to see themselves as accepted members of the larger society from which they have been alienated by the color of their skin for generations. This endeavor, therefore, is not an attempt to perpetuate existing unjust, arbitrary and disfunctional social relationships; it is, to the contrary, a realistic response to the facts of life.

Middle class values and behavior patterns characterize the mainstream of American life. The culturally-disadvantaged Negro is largely outside of that stream and, indeed, often incompatible with it, certainly in the urban centers of the nation. The very survival of the Negro and of the democratic way of life itself demands that no large segment of our population be allowed to be apart from this stream. Nor is this particular program an endeavor to lead pupils to believe that their dignity is enhanced by accepting middle class values. As a matter of fact, human dignity exists regardless of one's level in life, and actually cannot be destroyed or raised.

As for the recommendation about a "hard, close, symbolic analysis and interpretation of their own position in life", I would suggest that this is exactly what many culturally-disadvantaged individuals have done and have found wanting. Moreover, such an analysis, if it is to lead to any beneficial results, presupposes the self-images and motivations not to mention intellectual development, which the culturally-disadvantaged do not have because of their deficient backgrounds, so that analysis would be an impossibility in this sense.

Now, in terms of what can and cannot be done, I would like to take a minute to describe actually what we have bewn able to do in terms of reversing this kind of image, an actual achievement in our district. In the first place, we are on a decentralized form of administration so that the public elementary schools in St. Louis are divided into six geographical districts. The one of which I have the direction is known as the Banneker District. It's the slum area; it's the poor area. We have about 15,000 youngsters, kindergarten through grade 8. We are 90 to 95 percent Negro in both pupil population and in staff. I said we had about 15,000 youngsters in 23 schools.

Now we do have, of course, de facto segregation. We have two supervisors to help me operate the district. One of these is a white woman. We have two consultants, one in physical education and one in music. This is the team that is available to operate and run each of these districts. We have the authority and the autonomy within our own district to accomplish many of the things that have been suggested as good things to do.

We do not have a research design, and we have no large amounts of money. We have moved forward in the last six years to a point where the youngsters that were two years behind in the basic subjects at the end of eighth grade are now at about the national norm in reading, language usage, and arithmetic. We have created a situation in which the youngsters are more interested in school; they are better behaved there. They come to school -- and this, I think, is largely because of the cooperation of the parents -- to the point that of the six districts, only one exceeds our 92.5 percent of attendance for the last school year. And all you need to do is to recognize that in the large cities of our nation the percent of attendance is about 85 in a slum district.

In terms of the school personnel, we have reversed what you generally understand about, let's say, the principal. We meet every Thursday morning and we talk about many of the kinds of things that you have skirted here, which I would naturally expect you to do because you are not practitioners.

As a matter of fact, I think that one of the reasons I was willing to skip over and not comment on many of the things that Edgar stated in his paper was that he fell into the error of creating a school which had in it many of the things that he would not, as a planner and as a writer of the paper, have in it.

At any rate, let me maybe summarize the attitude of the principal. The typical attitude is -- and I say this to my principals -- is that you were a good fellow until I made you a principal. As soon as you make someone a principal, a school administrator, he goes up in the ivory tower and begins to write papers and do things of that kind, and, of course, this alienates him from everybody else in the establishment.

I summarize how far we have come with principals by saying that we've gotten our principals in the Banneker District to be willing now to sit down at the table and throw out the problems that they really have and talk them over, chew them up, accept and throw away those that are no good and try to implement those that are, to the point that they are willing to cooperate with teachers.

Now you can analyze that last statement sometime when you get home and see what it means in terms of the principal. At any rate, this is the attitude that we have been able to get with our school people. As a matter of fact, I would reiterate what has been well stated by someone here, that what we need most with respect to these youngsters who are disadvantaged is a change in our attitude toward them. Now, that's the one first big single thing that's needed.

The money won't make any difference until you get this change in attitude, and once you get the change in attitude, then you can make use of the services that the money will buy. But until that time, the money that comes will be like more water on a duck's back. All that it does is make it slicker. Until you get this kind of change in attitude, you are not going to benefit at all. You will get the same imperviousness as you had before.

We are very proud of the way our principals have recognized this kind of responsibility, the fact that they are the key people, that they set the tone for the school, and it is their attitude which counts most.

Now, we move from there to the teachers because this is a matter of strategy, and the strategy is that you can't wait for each segment of the teaching-learning situation to line up. You have to start to work on all of them at the same time -- the principal, the teacher, the youngster, the parent and the community that helps set some of the images which prove to be the hardest obstacles for us to overcome.

We work with our teachers. We get the principal to the point where he sees the problem, has some insight into it. We ask them to do four things. First, quit teaching by IQ. Most of you have read the story that we use to get this point over to the teachers. We meet with the teachers each semester to give them a little broader point of view and even more specifics than their own building principal would do. And one of these pleas was always to quit teaching by what we call IQ, and we tell the story of the teacher who has the IQ's. She calls on Mary. Mary has an IQ of 119. Mary doesn't respond very quickly, so what does the teacher do? "Now, come on, Mary, you can do this. You know you did it last week." Well, she starts pushing, she starts motivating, stimulating, encouraging, and she doesn't give up until she is satisfied with Mary's performance.

What happens, typically, when she calls on old Charles over here with his IQ of 71. Well, if he grunts clearly, she pats him on the shoulder: "That's fine. Now you be here tomorrow and we will move the piano and water the flowers and you can dust the erasers, and you can do all of these things." This is differentiating the instruction according to the ability of the kid. This is the kind of chance that old Charles gets. He doesn't have a sucker's chance. He has no such thing as an equal educational opportunity. What stimulation and motivation does he have? None.

So we asked them to cut out this kind of business. And they saw it. They know they label youngsters. This has been recited here before, and our teachers have stopped this because they have worked with these youngsters in another frame of reference.

And then we ask them to do what is even tougher -- abandon your attitude of condescension about working in this district. This is a really tough one. I won't go into it, but you have talked about these people who have come from disadvantaged areas going back. I don't think you quite realize all that's involved in this. It's tough for them, but once they understand the contribution that they can make, they are quite willing to do so and, I think, do a tremendous job.

Someone talked here about homework, about keeping parents and teachers well-informed. We placed test results on big charts so that they were unmistakeable and available for teachers and principals and parents. This made sense. If you really want to do something to catch up when you are so far behind it's obvious this needs attention. How are you going to catch up? Homework? Yes, although we understand the pros and cons of homework, and we did assign homework. Teachers recognize this as an extra chore.

Also, we ask the teachers to visit the homes, and this one won't win you any popularity contest with teachers. But they understood and as they began to change their attitudes, with any type of a program where an honest effort is made, you immediately get some kind of good result, and you have to be prepared to take advantage of this immediate result, even though it is small, to encourage greater effort and greater effort certainly, not necessarily, but in this situation produced greater achievement all the way around.

There are other things I could say about the teachers, but let me say only that they have responded, they have changed, and they have made the difference.

For the youngsters we have come up with all kinds of innovations. We haven't been held back by inflexible teachers. We use field trips, for example; we have a schedule from kindergarten through grade 8. The trips have different purposes at different levels: at the lower levels for increasing the experiential background; at the upper levels to inspire the students to aspire. We use the radio; we use activities to engage these youngsters in something meaningful to them. As a result, we have made a tremendous difference.

One of the field trips is described by Edgar as the "dine-out program." Moving on to the parents, we have challenged the parents, and I have one witness in here who came to one of our night meetings at a school of about 1000 youngsters, with 419 families represented, and I am certain he will testify that there were 350 registered in there -- quite a heartening sight such response from parents who are interested, and whom we managed to engage. We asked them to be the homework managers. Not only that, but we gave them instructions on what we had said to their youngsters on how to study. Somebody mentioned this. We provided all of this. We engaged these parents as well as the teachers. We involved them in making decisions of one kind or another to the point that they don't feel as if they are off on the sidelines with no contribution to make.

And I would challenge any of you who come to visit, to evaluate the morale, the atmosphere, the climate -- it's completely different. After a period of about six years we have a waiting list of teachers wanting to come in. We don't have any turnover. We have the lowest turnover in the city.

These are all first-class exhibits, Edgar, that this can be done and it is being done, and I invite you, and the others, to come and take a look at it. We have tackled television and the radio and the newspapers because they are as big culprits as any part of the establishment in setting up images that are almost impossible to overcome.

RESPONSE
by
Edgar Z. Friedenberg

I first must say that my previous suspicions that I had written the best of the papers have been to some extent confirmed in my own mind since I don't see how, otherwise, it could have excited the most responsive and, I think, analytical invective of the comments that I have heard.

Professor Goldberg put her finger right on the crucial issue. I am not sure it is a weakness, but certainly if it is a weakness, then it is a gross impairment in the paper. It is true that the paper implies that I was writing the public school system off very largely, and I think I was doing that largely out of personal revulsion to the atmosphere that I had endured in nine schools, two of them private -- it isn't the public school particularly -- in the course of the research which kept me full-time in these places.

I feel guilty as a citizen, as a part of the apparatus that requires people to spend what we call their formative years, though perhaps no longer since Ben Bloom*published his book, in this sort of moral or value center environment. So that is true, and I may well be wrong about it. I don't think I could have stood it myself, but I had to go through this experience and I wasn't willing, am not willing to compel other people to do it.

Because I was trying to stay within the terms of reference of the paper and speak of curriculum and content and process of the curriculum, I therefore did not give what seemed to me to be the most desirable alternative. My style may have prevented Sam from seeing how far over in my cheek my tongue was in describing my new institution, though I thought the last paragraph with its deliberate parody of bureaucratic prose would give that away. But my favorite

---

* Bloom, Benjamin S., STABILITY AND CHANGE IN HUMAN CHARACTERISTICS, New York, Wiley & Sons, 1964.

alternative would be, of course, something like the G.I. Bill, in which the students, or, in their younger age, the parents would have the alternative of designating that the state support provided for education be used to provide what would in effect be fellowship aid for attending a private school or a parochial school of his choice, if he wished.

The other crucial point that Professor Goldberg raised, namely, the demand that I come up with solutions, is an example of the moral position which I complained about in the paper; that is, that any situation which calls for moral judgment is immediately restructured by what I have been calling the American middle-class into a problem to be solved in the terms of reference to the solution then taken to make the process work. This is why -- while I am quite certain that Mr. Shepard's school district is handling the problem quite as effectively as he says, I am still not certain whether it is overriding the moral issues that I am concerned about, or whether it is indeed providing an alternative to it that I would find a good deal more acceptable.

I'm not, of course, opposed to psychotherapy; I'm opposed to its institutionalization in a form in which a student becomes a case whether he want to or not. And, again, I though Professor Goldberg rather illustrated that in saying that maybe Johhny was just acting out.

Well, the point was that the kids had only deliberately two sentences about Johhny, and they proceeded to such a conclusion. Despite the fact that I had very carefully not given them any basis for any clinical judgment whatsoever they immediately decided to assume a clinical postulate, which is a most unattractive one in most 16-year-olds, I think.

I want, now, to shift to a couple of Mr. Shepard's points.

I didn't, of course, say -- and here I'd better read the sentence quite specifically -- about the "dine-out" thing, that you were teaching the students to view acceptance of middle-class values as ratifying their way.

I agree with you that human dignity can neither be created nor destroyed and that's why it disturbs me so much to have a person's self-esteem hinge on being able to gain the acceptance of a series of middle-class commercial institutions. Of course, I agree that you have to have these techniques to operate in this world, just as I have learned fair French, although France is not a country that I greatly admire. But it's more convenient to be able to speak it when I'm in France. I don't suppose this leads Frenchmen to think that I am a Frenchman, and if it does, then they don't know as much about their own identity as I wish that they did.

It's the fidelity to the whole pattern of one's own experience that concerns me.

And, finally, I would like to especially support Dr. Shepard's conclusion about what generally happens when teachers adapt to what they conceive to be low I.Q. potentialities and the way this cuts off any opportunity for the kids.

In my study, no student had the least difficulty in his interview, in discussing the story that he had read. Low I.Q. students did not make any less sense in discussing the episode, and quite often did better than students with higher I.Q.'s. They took account of more of the factors and also made somewhat more independent judgments. They didn't look around quite as hard to figure out what I must want, it seemed to me, and then tried to start by giving me that.

But the reading disabilities that are supposed to be pervasive and certainly ought to have manifested themselves under these conditions, where the kid was regarding himself quite properly as a colleague in the investigation, did not manifest themselves.

ADDITIONAL QUERIES AND RESPONSES

Arthur Bestor: In the first place, I found the paper was one of the most exciting of all those presented at the Conference, and I think I agree almost completely with Dr. Friedenber's indictment of the situation. As he pointed out, I do believe in public schools. I think the public school is an inescapable mechanism through which major educational purposes are to be accomplished, and I cannot see the workability of a schemed private choice. It seems to me it will be distorted by far more obvious factors such as racial ones and social tasks than it will be by a kind of intellectual independence.

Accordingly, since I do agree with Dr. Friedenberg's indictment but not with his solution, it seems to me we ought to think along slightly different lines as to the corollaries to be drawn from, or the conclusions to be drawn from his argument.

In my judgment, the important thing is to make very clear in our own minds -- and I think Dr. Friedenberg has enabled us to do this - the grave dangers in concepts that at one time served as useful functions, in a way, because they were exaggerations but were not likely to be taken seriously. The slogan, for example, that we educate the whole child is very enlightening if we are neglecting to pay attention to side effects. Under other circumstances it is a warning. We must be very careful what we do because we are doing this, and that we have no right to make education into a totalitarian institution or a total institution, as Dr. Friedenberg has said.

Now, it strikes me that the very important thing, therefore, is, in defining the purposes or the functions, to consider a restrictive list, and not, as so many educational prospectuses, promise the moon -- going to do everything about a child's personality. I think we've got to draw up for education some self-denying ordinances. There are certain things that we are going to do. They inevitably alter the child. Education means nothing if it doesn't create some deliberate alteration. And in view of that fact, there are certain areas in which we have no right to intrude. We already have a model for that, I think, in the First Amendment, the separation of church and state. It is a perfectly respectable argument that religious belief is so entwined with other items of our society that it is arbitrary to cut religion out of the school. Yet we have made the choice constitutionally that we will do so, and we are, I think, properly sensitive to any crossing of the line, which would turn the school into one designed to turn all students into Protestants or all students into Christians or all students into Theists. We have no right to intervene in that area.

I think there are a great many forms of intervention which show up in the tests which Dr. Friedenberg has reported on, but which are illegitimate interferences. I don't think -- and he has given up the use of the term "middle-class" -- I don't think that's a good way to look at it. There are, however, elements of a child's personality that may be unpleasant to the teacher but which, it seems to me, the teacher is morally obligated completely to disregard and not to undertake to change ir order to produce a child that will be more appealing.

I think, therefore, one of the great needs is a list of areas which are sacred from intrusion by educationists. This is perhaps easier to say as a college progessor than as a elementary school teacher, quite obviously, but I do consider certain aspects of my own students private lives utterly beyond any business of mine, and I would never allow myself to inquire into them, and I would under many circumstances refuse even to listen if they wanted to confide in me. That's not my function. I think it stands in the way of my function.

In this connection it seems to me there is grave danger in the use of the word "behavior" to describe the outcome of education. Now, behavior in a purely technical sense in which the behavioral scientists would use it in a limited sense, if of course, all right. If I am to write an historical paper I go through some form of behavior, including sitting down at the typewriter and reading books. If you want to describe this as behavior, that's all right, although it seems to me unnecessary.

I feel, however, that there are dangers in words themselves. When you begin to talk about education in terms of changing behavior, that opens the way to making all behavior subject to educational change. Also, it emphasizes, it seems to me, certain things, certain overt things when, in the outcome of some educational processes, we might not be interested in overt conduct.

I would feel it important that when I learned to read Shakespeare, for example, I can go to a performance of Lear and I can read a performance of Lear. There is no overt behavior connected with this that anyone is going to measure. I have an inner satisfaction in this. I have an inner satisfaction in a great many ways, and I don't like the use of the term "behavior" in this connection.

The emphasis on behavior and measurement of behavior and the talking about examinations and tests as if they were simply measurements is fallacious. The phrase test and measurement goes together, of course. But the word examination or test is not necessarily connected with the idea of quantitative measurement. If a man meets a test in the ordinary realm of life, he has accomplished something; he's done what was required; he's done it well or badly, and if he has not failed he has met the test of going into war, of climbing a mountain or whatever. Examination, likewise, it seems to me, is not suggestive of recorded data in quantitative form.

When we examine something other than in this context, we are looking something over very carefully. I do very strongly object to the increasing limitation of the concept of examination or test to that of a measurable quantity.

Dr. Taylor, for example, said that Sarah Lawrence dispensed with tests and examination, and so on, and then proceeded to describe what I would regard as a very adequate and admirable examination, how the student would work and finally produce a play with a ballet and so on connected with it of her own composition, I judge. What better test could there be? And it seems to me all such programs that eventuate in some satisfactory performance are ones in which there is testing and examination, even if there is no measurement whatsoever.

Furthermore, we talked about the bad side-effects of some of these things. There are, after all, certain benificent side-effects in some kinds of examinations which are totally missing in others. I would like to speak once more of the very great importance of essay examination, of long pieces of writing or of papers written outside at some length. I am not talking about volumes; I am talking about something that is more than a few sentences. For these are tests in the sense than an intelligent adult must learn to state his views clearly in writing. It may be a test in history to find out how well he reasons on historical matters, but it also is an exemplification which permits the teacher to examine a totality instead of a measure of some element which may or may not be significant if pulled out of context.

In this connection I would like also to talk about other objections I have to some of the matters dealt with in the computer programmed school we discussed this morning. Nothing was said about side-effects -- now I'm talking about adverse ones -- on the teachers themselves. If you are going to get some sort of device which will aid the teacher in mechanical processes and cut down the labor there, I certainly have no great fear of the machine. But if you are speaking, as it seemed to me Mr. Flanagan's paper this morning did speak of them, of a machine that is to take over the processes of judgment which the teacher must exercise, I don't think you are doing her a service; I don't think you are doing the schools a service.

It is, it seems to me, inconceivable that a machine is going to operate better to keep out of the hands of 10-year-olds, let's say, readers which they can't read. Somebody must detect that, presumably the teacher. She finds the student cannot read this book. She doesn't have to code it for a computer to get the answer back: give him a different one.

I think of the side-effects on the teacher of making her even less capable or less called upon to exercise judgment in her profession, becoming more and more a clerk and it seems to me in the long prospective the recruitment of teachers will be so seriously injured if, instead of their deciding these questions, making their own judgments, some tape was coming out of the computer and telling them what to do next, and they would be becoming, in effect, the slaves to the computer which was making the basic decisions.

In effect, the argument of Mr. Friedenberg's paper also has as one of its corollaries a careful examination of what we do in the selection of teachers. Since personality traits figure so largely in the discussion of the qualifications of teachers we encourage the teacher to apply the same criteria to the student, and I think we have a vicious circle in this respect.

Martin Mayer: I have already offered to Edgar (Friedenberg) that when he gets his tax exemption I will make an annual contribution to the breakage fund of the Friedenberg Wiltwick, whenever such hotels are begun, and I have a great deal of sympathy with the position.

I think, however, that in frankly admitting that he writes off the public schools, that the thing is sort of placed in a frame. I don't think we can. I think there are things that both Edgar and I would love to live without that we can't live without; we are going to have to live with.

But I agree with him the clinical attitude isn't wonderful. We don't have to live with this to anything like the extent that we do today. And the whole business of individual differences has been perverted so dreadfully by these people as to deny the right to fail. In this constant effort to protect children from failure, we are distorting the texture of their lives and the meaning of being human and of having dignity.

This whole business of the teacher know the child can't read the book -- the child want to read the book. For God's sake, let him try. It may be very useful to him to try to read a book he wants to read that he can't read. It may produce a very sonciderable teaching opportunity. Don't put into a computer the fact that the child can't read the book and then tell him: no, you can't read this. It doesn't really interest you. You just think it does. We know what you need.

We have in Junior High School 167 in New York at present roughly a 50-50 balance of kids from East Harlem and kids from Yorkville. We have something called the Algebra Readiness Test which is administered by New York City and which is absolutely sacrosanct and as a result of this our algebra classes are about 93% mainland white Yorkville and about 7% Negroes and Puerto Ricans from Harlem in a school which is about 50-50. The Negro and Puerto Rican parents are up in arms about this, and I am right behind them and so is my district superintendent, by the way.

The Junior High School Division is fighting back and is fighting back with all of the weapons of authority of the bureaucracy. The argument is that if we take a hundred kids from Spanish Harlem and we put them into the algebra class, the odds are 70-30 against these hundred kids passing the algebra. That's fine. If they want to take algebra and they want to fail it, let them take it. It's what you are doing to these 30 kids who could pass that's the real prime concern in this situation, and what you are doing to the 70 who want to try and you tell them: you are not even good enough to try. That is absolutely insane. And this is being done in the name of democracy and of helping children and of adjusting for individual differences. Your're telling them at every turn, "You stink".

It won't do. It must stop. Even if the tests were absolutely first-rate, there would be a great deal to be said against it. But given the gross imperfections of the existing testing mechanisms, when you can arouse a degree of desire in these kids to move on and to do something, then tell them they can't do it, this is an awful thing, indeed.

This is a question of life. This is a question, also, of institutionalizing injustice for fear that individuals will do injustice. Of course they will. They always have. Teachers will be unjust. They will be unjust whether you use standardized tests or you don't use standardized tests. But don't give them the color of authority from something that call itself science for the purpose of allowing them and helping them to be unjust. Leave this thing as free at the seams as you can leave it. You are dealing with human beings. You aren't dealing with pieces of paper and IBM machines.

What upsets me so about most of the tests and measurement discussion is this notion that somehow we can fit them all onto punch cards and we can run them through the machine and we can really handle human problems that way.

Edgar's paper is enormously valuable for pointing out that several of the aspects in which we are doing this and what the clinical attitude seems to do to the kids.

Edgar Friedenberg: May I have a brief response in clarification, not simply something that's come up as peripheral to Martin's (Mayer) point; it's rather central to mine and I've allowed a distortion.

I didn't, of course, suppose that by writing off the public schools I would cause them to disappear. That would be a gross error in theology. It isn't what I want at all. I am not in favor of substituting this choice of a private school for the public school system. In other words, I don't want the public school discontinued.

John H. McKenna: There have been a few things that have come up here during the course of the discussion that have aroused me one way or another. I'd appreciate just one minute to say my little piece and I will get off the program.

No. 1, this whole business of testing -- it seemed to me that people were really beating to death a rather dead horse for sure this morning. To begin with, there are very few people now extant in education who believe that the I.Q. test has very much of the sacrosanct attitude about it that it once had, and certainly I have not run into many teachers who put that much reliance on it. They are reasonable human beings. They use it as a general help when necessary. In fact, for years we haven't even referred to such a thing as an I.Q.

But the main point about testing is this: it's too bad all you folks were talking about survey tests and nobody bothered to identify the fact that the one thing that is of value is a diagnostic test -- and Mr. Gallagher, however, did that a the beginning of this session. I was glad to hear that.

Secondly, I should like to say something about the teacher. The teacher is the whipping-boy. By law all of us are teachers in the State of New Jersey. That includes superintendents. I think that we should stop this stereotyping that everybody laments here and yet procedds to use so freely.

We need teachers who have a good understanding of growth and development, who know how to use diagnostic techniques and are able to take the results of these diagnoses and use suitable prescriptive techniques. We need teachers who have an understanding of Bruner and his psychological basis for learning, some understanding of anthropology and sociology, and who, above all, are experts in inter-personal relationships. They must also know and be able to use group dynamics, have excellent rapport with children, are continuously and always enthusiastic, never have a bad day but always show a genuine enjoyment of being with children. With such teachers, we wouldn't have the problems.

My point is that if we are going to do anything about equality and quality in education, the one crucial factor is the teacher in the classroom. And the sooner we face this issue objectively, the better off we are going to be. If we can exercise our influence on this individual person and her relationship with the 25 youngsters for whom she is responsible, then we don't have to worry about the misuse of tests or anything else of this nature.

So I really plead, before we terminate, that we should admit that by and large the teachers are human beings and they have a great human interest in these children and, given half a chance, they will deal with these children in an equitable manner.

Chester R. Stroup: First of all, I want to express my appreciation to Dr. Shepard for having put the trolley back on the tracks once more, and there were times when I think we were forgetting some of the purposes for our being here.

We have often heard it siad that as the priest goes, so goes the parish. Apparently Dr. Shepard has been quite effective in his work in St. Louis in converting some priests along the way.

What I am saying is this. Apparently you have done a rather magnificent job of changing attitudes of the so-called middle-man, the man between the superintendent of schools and the classroom teacher, and we do know that there are bottlenecks at this stage along the way.

I would be very much interested in hearing him expand a bit more on the techniques, the approach that he used to effect some of these changes.

Samuel Shapard: Let me take one second in the context to describe one strategy that I have used with principals. Before doing that, I want to second what Dr. McKenna has said, that we try to see that the teacher does get the consideration that you spoke of, and, of course, it's the principal who really makes this possible.

We are not at the point where the union is about to throw us out in St. Louis, but it's on the horizon. As a matter of fact you probably read on the 8th where they will have paraded in front of the Board of Education prior to its night meeting.

And I'm not saying that this is perhaps possible anywhere else. I took advantage of this, and this has been two years in the making, to say: why should the union force you as a principal to do what you ought to do as far as according the rights of these people with whom you work? I think we work with principals who happen to be alert to take advantage of every opportunity to see that this gets over. Until the union or the teachers' organizations become the bargaining agents, I am still going to use this as a strategy to further implement the idea. But I think we've gotten to the point, as I say, where principals are willing to cooperate with teachers, to listen.

As a matter of fact, my theory to any beginning principal is: if you want to be a great principal, toss the problems out on the table before your faculty and be smart and put your ear to the table and listen and they will make a great principal out of you.

But, you see, there are certain other factors in people when they become principals that won't let them listen and won't let them cooperate. Now, you have to have the cooperation all the way up and down the line.

This will give me the opportunity to say to you that the deputy superintendent and the superintendent accompanied me to a faculty meeting in every one of these schools. The deputy superintendent made 57 meetings with me in one semester, once with a faculty meeting, once with an honor assembly with the kids, and once with the meeting with the parents. So this is real honest-to-goodness interest, sincere all the way up and down the line.

John Henry Martin: I thoroughly enjoyed Miriam's (Goldberg) statement and I would like to say nothing in exception to what she had to say, but certain working applications of the inferences. Aside from the anarchic direction that I think Friedenberg's paper would lead us into, specifically in terms of his wishful thing. I don't think he is recommending something new, I think he is describing what is already in effect almost a process -- the withdrawal from the public school, without the sanction of the tuitional payments, and on a large-scale basis, as I see it.

I think what we have been getting from Bruner and from Bloom we need on a thousandfold increase. I am not speaking to pre-school education; I am talking to the effect that in the last ten years we have moved from the kind of intellectual corsetry of the argumentation between Gestaltist and Thorndykians and so-called learning theory, and I don't think we have had very much practical consequence flow from this.

What I am asking for in Bloom and Bruner and 150, 175, 200 more such people is an analysis of the learning process itself; a systematization of this process and, with it, a systematized analysis of instruction, that is, the adult behavior atmosphere creations, the environmental structuring, Montessorian or otherwise, that are the converse of the system of learning.

The individualization of instruction, in a linkage between the practical procedures that Sam(Shepard) talked about, the classroom situation that Miriam (Goldberg) described, is an indication of what we are after. I've worked out, gropingly, with some good deal more to be done, an individualization of supervision of instruction in which principals keep an open, joint reporting of teacher growth and teacher development in specifics of classroom instructional procedures. How do you run a good field trip? And this file folder is a jointly-kept proposition between the classroom teacher and the principal, as the chief supervisor of the school. This is an open, running journalistic "Dear Diary" entry of a growth proposition and it has a number of important by-products. It is a training of the principal, from where I sit, in a procedure in teaching teachers that is remarkably transferrable by the teacher's use of a similar individualization of a file on each student kept jointly by the student and the teacher as a running growth record of the child's progress. This is a long way from IBM computerizing. But it is journalistic and its accent is on those areas of growth that the school is basically concerned with; that is, intellectual development and growth.

SESSION SIX

Theme: THE RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING OF SCHOOLMEN

Introduction DAVID SALTEN 1

Theme Paper and Supplementary Comments ROBERT J. SCHAEFER 1 - 17 a

Discussion JUDSON SHAPLIN 18 - 24

Discussion THEODORE SIZER 25 - 32

Response ROBERT J. SCHAEFER 33 - 34

Additional Queries and Comments 35 - 54

INTRODUCTION
by
David Salten

I want to say that I have read Dean Schaefer's paper with great interest and profit because it touches on something which is very close to the heart of every school superintendent -- because of its significance in the recruitment, selection and promotion of teachers; namely, the reward system under which teachers operate. Unlike most studies which deal with the superficial phenomena of salaries and fringe benefits and the status rewards, status as envisaged either by the teachers themselves or by other members of the community, I think Dean Schaefer's paper really gets down to the central issue of the problem.

I found it rather interesting that he distinguishes continually between the tangible rewards and the psychic rewards. I am not sure that I understand just what that distinction means, because ultimately I suppose all our rewards take place somewhere between our ears. But despite this comment, I do want to say that I am certain this morning we are in for some very high-level discussion following a paper which has made a great deal of sense to me and is really going to affect the conduct of our own enterprise when I get home.

At this point I'd like to call on Dean Schaefer to add anything he wishes to the paper.

Conference on QUALITY AND EQUALITY IN EDUCATION
Princeton University
December 2 to 4, 1964

THE RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING OF SCHOOLMEN

Robert J. Schaefer

When asked his estimate of the probable impact of the current interest in educational innovations, one experienced observer of the schools, Martin Mayer, responded:

> "Because the crisis in American education over the last decade was caused primarily by failures of intelligence and leadership, it is not possible to predict where we are going to wind up. Too much depends on accident. The quality of reform movements is largely a function of the ability and devotion of the people who lead them, and we have no demonstrated way to attract people of the necessary scholarship, imagination, and wit into work for education." [1]

Given the magnitude of the difficulties besetting the schools, it is easy to share such pessimism about educational change. Given also the volume of incriminating evidence readily available, we who are educationists are compelled, albeit with blushing countenances, to accept such an indictment of our intellectual capacities. But the problem of improving education -- in this specific case, furthering quality and equality in American schools -- seems to be dependent upon more complex factors than the level of wit among educators. Even the sub-problem of recruiting and training teachers and administrators for the successful discharge of this task would appear to be of such proportions as to demand much more than mere mental agility to resolve it.

---

[1] Martin Mayer, "Changes in American Education in the Next Decade: Some Predictions" in Matthew B. Miles, INNOVATION IN EDUCATION, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York 1964, p. 625.

Rather than attempt to sketch some idealized program of recruitment and training therefore, it might be wiser -- after all, who wants to have his wit subjected to public dissection -- to examine a more manageable question. What is the reward system currently operative in American Education? What are the come-hither attributes of the schools, and once seduced into teaching, what satisfactions are likely to be repeatedly consummated? Hopefully, analysis of instrinsic job satisfactions may provide cues as to the kinds of changes necessary in public attitudes, organizational structure, political support, and economic investment, as well, if indeed it makes much difference, in the IQ scores of educationists.

There is strangely little serious discussion of the psychic satisfactions in teaching. One might imagine a profession which by definition is dedicated to the fulfillment of non-material ends would be most articulate about the non-material and intrinsic rewards available to its practitioners. In fact, however, one has to probe carefully in educational literature to find even the most perfunctory reference to the personal satisfactions inherent in either the teaching or the administrative roles.

There is, on the other hand, a great mass of material about extrinsic job satisfactions -- such matters as the social status of teachers, salaries, working conditions, security and fringe benefits. There is also a voluminous mass of testimonial literature -- that is, individual reporting either in praise of children and nurturant teachers or acrimonious laments from the over-burdened and the disillusioned -- but such testimony too rarely ascends above the stereotypical or the sentimental. The great bulk of reliable information available describes extrinsic factors.

Data on salary schedules, for example, can be readily summarized. The real income of teachers declined in the inflationary period during and following World War II and their economic position relative to other occupations continued to decline, despite considerable dollar increases, through the early fifties. During the past ten years, since the rate of annual yearly salary increase has remained constant, teachers have overtaken many other occupations and now enjoy higher real income than at any time since the 1890's. Beginning salaries place teaching only slightly below (and for women, well above) favored vocations in average yearly income and increments in the first several years ordinarily maintain this relatively desirable position. Less happily, currently favorable trends, which even if continued would not predict an economic utopia, are threatened by limitations of the real estate tax base undergirding education.

While there is less justification, then, for widespread public alarm over the economic plight of the teacher, salary schedules are not sufficiently attractive to woo the more demanding and discriminating males. The flaws and blemishes in the salary picture remain too apparent. In the first place, gains have been geographically unevent; small towns and rural communities, the entire south, upper New England, and large stretches of the midwest should be avoided. Salaries in large urban centers, where the problem of providing quality and equality is most acute, have tended to lag well behind those available in suburbia. Probably more basically repellent is the relatively small span between entering and retiring salaries. Unless he escapes into administration, and there the personal costs are high, the male teacher by his early thirties must learn to tolerate the inconveniences and the societally-imposed sense of failure in being out-distanced in the competitive economic race. Finally, teaching in the lower schools, despite sporadic efforts toward change, remains a basically egalitarian vocation. Although the culture, verbally at least, places high value upon rewarding unusual energy and talent, teachers have resisted attempts to relate salary to meritorious performance. In a word, while it is true that many individual school systems have been seeking new means for rewarding particularly able practitioners, teaching is still perceived and in fact largely is a vocation which over a career offers minimal financial reward.

The general bleakness of the present situation should not obscure the fact that many individuals, foundations and school systems have been striving to improve long-term career prospects. Particularly notable have been efforts to modify the traditional craft system of one teacher for one classroom (which assumes equal skills among teacher-craftsmen) and to organize instructional teams based upon a more rational division of labor. Creating new ranks and new positions in instructional staffs opens the possibility of relating payment to the level of skill and responsibility required of a particular role.[2] It is much easier to justify salaries differentiated by a hierarchy of positions and ranks than to base income upon a subjective comparison of individuals performing the same task (merit salary scheme). In the main, however, these early efforts to increase the attractiveness of a long-term career in teaching are neither sufficiently developed nor widely enough adopted to exert much influence upon the magnetism of the field. Many of the attempts to break the lock-step rigidity of typical salary schedules, moreover, have occured in well-

[2] See, for example, Charles Benson's discussion on "position and rank systems of classification" in his THE ECONOMICS OF PUBLIC EDUCATION, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1961, p. 435.

endowed suburban communities rather than in the central cities.

But if salaries remain more a deterent than an inducement, perhaps the traditional lures of a short work week, frequent holidays, a prolonged summer vacation, and optimum security adequately compensate. While there is some evidence that the appeal of such fringe benefits has become stronger rather than weaker, there are contrary pressures undermining their effectiveness in recruitment. [3] The school year grows longer, the summer months are frequently preempted for such official school duties as curriculum revision and the necessity for moonlighting is increasingly well known. More basically, there is considerable doubt that the attractiveness of a comparatively light work load (more fantasy than reality at any rate) and the pull of maximum security are appropriate baits for snaring the type of personnel desired. Ironically, this type of appeal appears to be more effective for persons seeking appointment in large urban centers than for teachers as a whole.

Another factor ostensibly related to recruiting prospects is the degree of prestige afforded teachers. On this question of social status there is a considerable literature and a high degree of consistency in support of two or three general findings. The teacher's perceptions of his own status is consistently lower than the status actually accorded him by others. Where the teacher is placed on the prestige totem pole is closely related to who does the rating. In small towns and rural areas generally, and in urban areas among working class and lower middle class respondents, teaching is ordinarily ranked among the top five occupations. The prestige afforded teachers, however, tends to diminish as would easily be predicted, in relation to the ascending class position of respondents. Research on status, moreover, frequently suggests that the term "teacher" is not a unitary concept. Status for the elementary school teachers continues to be less than that granted to instructors in the secondary schools. There is also likely to be differences in the way the public perceives teachers of particular subjects and even for distinctions to be made upon the basis of student populations taught -- honors versus average classes and senior and junior year students versus freshmen groups. Those who teach lower-class children in urban centers are generally regarded as unfit for "better" suburban systems. Among members of the profession itself it is tacitly understood that fully qualified and competent teachers remain in large cities only to protect their position on the salary schedule or their investment in retirement. Prestige among teachers, mysteriously, is granted in inverse proportion to the difficulties of the assignment; those who instruct children who will learn under almost any circumstances are deemed most honorable.

---

[3] See, for example, the reported importance attached to such matters by teachers in the New York University study on TEACHER MOBILITY IN NEW YORK CITY, A STUDY OF THE RECRUITMENT, SELECTION, APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION OF TEACHERS IN THE NEW YORK SCHOOLS.

One aspect of prestige -- the intellectual standing of teachers -- has been of particular concern to educators. Embarrassed by the oft-quoted findings of studies on the academic ability of prospective teachers relative to other college majors, we have developed an over-riding concern for "up-grading" the profession. We have assumed uncritically that the average intellectual level of the present teaching force directly influences the caliber of people who can be attracted to the field. Accordingly, we have perhaps unduly concentrated on the problem of recruiting "good" teachers to the relative neglect of analysis of the nurturant qualities of the institutions to which we were recruiting. Obviously the schools need all the wit they can muster, but whether intellectual capacity of any degree flourishes or declines depends upon the richness or the aridity of the environment in which it must exist.

There would seem to be a certain genetic bias, as W. W. Charters has suggested, in our emphasis upon capability with so little concurrent regard for the social circumstances within which capability may develop. Although he was characterizing certain areas of educational research rather than approaches to recruitment Charters' conclusions are relevant:

> "Many investigators appear to regard the individual's potential or manifest capability in teaching as a relatively enduring, relatively immutable attribute which is somehow fixed in early childhood and remains basically unaffected by subsequent experience . . . But whatever its source, the conception of capability turns investigators toward the formative influence of the past and away from the contemporary influences of the present. Thus, greater interest is shown in the motives which once propelled teachers into the occupation than in how the motives are transformed by more immediate social circumstances. More research is conducted on the social origins of teachers than on their present social relations." [4]

* * * * *

Hopefully, the preceding paragraphs on salaries, fringe benefits and social status have paid due respect to the significance of such external factors in recruiting teachers for the schools. Probably, as was asserted at the outset, the kinds of psychic rewards available in the instructional situation itself are of more fundamental importance to the teacher than the tangible apples society may choose to place on his desk.

---

[4] W. W. Charters Jr. "The Social Background of Teaching" in N. L. Gage, editor of HANDBOOK OF RESEARCH ON TEACHING, American Educational Research Association, Rand McNally Co., (Chicago, 1963), pp. 803-804.

The psychic rewards available to the teacher depend upon the congruity between his personal motivations, his collegiate preparation for the task, and the instructional opportunities of his particular situation. What the individual seeks in the teaching role depends on a wide range of factors. The single umbrella word "teacher" covers, or more precisely obscures, vast differences in career intent, in psychological need structure, in intelligence, in training, in experience, and in attitudes towards ideas and towards children.

The diversity of motives held by teachers is readily apparent, but a few illustrations may be in order. Different levels, for example, of the educational enterprise -- nursery, elementary, secondary, and college -- attract different kinds of people. In turn, the particular school level exerts an influence upon the value orientations and attitudes of the persons associated within it. It is not only that the environment of the elementary school encourages nurturant and maternal as opposed to analytical attitudes, but also that the elementary school tends to attract persons who score high on tests of personal warmth and relatively low on tests of ability to manipulate verbal abstractions. Similarly, while certain educationists were once prone to lament the secondary school's emphasis upon subject matter, the high school teacher found it easy to ignore the complaints because it was his interest in a particular field which first attracted him to the secondary school. In comparable fashion, many of the conflicts within the Junior High School can be explained by the fact that its staff is typically constituted in approximately equal proportions by persons originally drawn to elementary and to secondary levels.

But the educational level at which the teacher serves is only one of many variables affecting his motivations and his job satisfactions. In common with all human beings teachers vary in personality and in the goals they deem to be important. A particular teacher may find satisfaction in the class's precise mastery of new materials, another in the small success of a heretofore slow learner, another in the unexpected response of a withdrawn child, and still another in the eventual submission of a rebellious heckler. The classroom is, fortunately or unfortunately, a sovereign kingdom and the teacher is relatively free to emphasize the goals he chooses. This autonomy is offset, of course, by the cultural press of the institution and of the larger social system, but the privacy of the teacher's world is nonetheless real. A principal, for example, can expect differential acceptance of organizational innovations, such as team teaching, of increased use of television, or of automated self-teaching devices according to their perceived impact upon the rewards deemed important by the individual teacher. An instructor who gains important satisfaction from his inter-personal relations with the students is hardly likely to applaud the introduction of team teaching if it threatens to substitute the mere possibility of rewarding interactions with colleagues for the warm surety of former relations with students. Similarly, a particular teacher, depending on his personal values, may react to programming as a means of reducing the time spent in aversive supervision of drill, or as an odious device for the administrative structuring and control of the teacher's prerogatives. [5]

An equally obvious factor affecting the motivations teachers bring to the job is the simple distinction of sex. Male teachers enter the field with markedly different career expectations than those normally held by women. According to one group of investigators approximately 70 percent of beginning male teachers do not expect to continue teaching until retirement -- slightly over 50 percent express the hope of moving to some other area of education, and 20 percent assume at the outset that they will leave teaching for another occupation. [6] In contrast, much less than 30 percent (actually half that number) of the beginning women teachers expect continuous careers in the classroom -- 60 percent expect to be homemakers who may wish to return to active teaching later; less than 15 percent aspire to roles in education other than classroom teaching; and only 5 percent entertain the possibility of entering another occupation. Such sex differences in career expectations strongly suggest comparable differences in the rewards appropriate to both groups. It would appear that school administrators concerned with retaining their teaching staff must seek in part different solutions for their men and women teachers. For the men, they must fund ways of making teaching a more attractive and rewarding occupation, both financially and as a productive outlet for intellectual energy. For the women, they must search for social inventions which will reduce the conflict between occupational and family responsibilities and make simultaneous performance in the two roles more feasible.

---

[5] These comments are largely drawn from an unpublished paper by Daniel Lortie of the University of Chicago.

[6] Ward S. Mason, Robert J. Dressel, and Robert K. Bain, "Sex Role and the Career Orientations of Beginning Teachers" in Charters, W. W. Jr. and Gage, N.L., Editors, READINGS IN THE SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY OF EDUCATION, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, 1963, p. 28.

But there is no need for a further elaboration of the variety of factors affecting the motivation of teachers. There are other types of diversity which influence the distribution of rewards. Just as the concept "teacher" obscures important differences, so the term "teaching" falsely suggests that the concrete practices of teaching comprise a single art. In this connection Judson Shaplin has made an insightful observation:

> "Within the arts, recognition as an artist in one area of specialization does not entitle the artist to recognition in other related areas. For example, the concern pianist is not simultaneously granted recognition as conductor, composer, music critic, music historian, or even piano teacher. Each status must be earned in terms of the talent and skill required for that particular specialty. The argument by analogy between art and teaching tends to ignore the specializations that occur in each. Teaching is made up of many aspects, each requiring its own specialization; knowledge of subject, selection of content, inter-action with students, the learning process. Talent and specialization in one or another aspect of teaching as an art, does not grant one recognition in, nor exemption from the other important aspects of teaching . An argument by analogy between art and teaching cannot ignore the varieties of specialization." [7]

As may be inferred from Shaplin's argument, analysis of satisfactions in teaching cannot ignore the fact that differentiated quality of performance, and hence differentiated psychic reward, is to be expected by individual teachers as they unevenly practice the various arts of teaching. The point is important in clarifying the rewards available to teachers. More important still is the probability that skills in all aspects of instruction may be required to awaken the latent intellectual curiosity of lower class children.

Assuming that multiple teaching skills are demanded, how are they acquired? The initial preparation of teachers is conventionally conceived as consisting of three parts: general education, specialized studies in the discipline or disciplines to be taught, and professional training for teaching. Since the teacher's need for a general liberating experience is precisely the same as that of any other college students, no comment is required here. The prospective teacher's special preparation in his teaching field has improved markedly in recent years -- the vocational emphasis of the old normal school has long disappeared from the educational scene -- and the new teacher (unless employed in a small school and forced to teach out of field) is likely to be as well-informed in his special subject as it would be feasible to expect. Obviously what might be considered an optimum degree of knowledge is unobtainable, but sufficient command of an area to meet normal requirements of the classroom can be expected. The major problem with the specialized knowledge ordinarily possessed by new teachers is that it is not organized for instructional purposes.

---

[7] Shaplin, Judson, "Practice in Teaching in Smith," Elmer, R.,editor. TEACHER EDUCATION: A REAPPRAISAL, Harper and Row, New York, 1962, p. 108.

Indeed, a frequently observable phenomenon is the disillusionment of some academically able students who elect to teach in the lower schools. Seeking to perpetuate his own intellectual pleasure in exploring a particular subject, an unwary beginner may imagine that the pupils will almost automatically come to share his joys and his enthusiasms. The reality shock of the first year for such a neophyte is often catastrophic. Unless he can direct some of his intellectual energies to the re-formulation of materials from his teaching field, he is likely to be punished rather than rewarded by the responses of his charges. This is not at all to suggest that a live enthusiasm and a continuing hunger for knowledge are less than essential; it is only to point out that intelligence and reflection must be applied to the psychological translation of content as well as directly to ideas and concepts. Because we have been disastrously unsuccessful in convincing prospective teachers of the potential intellectual rewards in the manipulation of content for particular audiences, many young people have been driven ignominiously from the field.

Although other pedagogical issues may be involved, dramatic failures are often due to the discontinuity between content organized for the demands of collegiate specialization and content appropriate to the general education of younger pupils. Such a discontinuity occurs with particular frequency when the new teacher accepts a position in a lower class school. Translating the patterned abstractions and conventions of upper level college courses into terms appropriate to an elementary or secondary program requires enormous effort and a good deal of intelligence. As my colleague at Teachers College, Lawrence Cremin, has remarked, "It's one thing to design a history program for the 70 to 80 IQ's, and another thing, much easier, to say, 'He's too dumb. Let's give him shop.'"[8]

---

[8] Quoted in Martin Mayer, THE SCHOOLS, Harper and Bros., New York, 1961, p. 119.

Who is to help the new teacher to communicate the excitement and the relevance of his teaching field to pupils whose attitudes and social experience ill equip him to respond to either the discipline or the pleasure of systematic study? Obviously, responsibility cannot be delegated to the substantive collegiate departments, for they are neither staffed nor inclined to take on the task. A possible answer is James Conant's conception of the clinical professor of education, but scholar-teachers of the sort Conant envisages are in extremely short supply at best. It is presumably now among the responsibilities of the professor of pedagogy, but scholars interested in methods of teaching are ordinarily more concerned with other aspects of practice than the organization of content for particular classes. This is not as reprehensible as it may seem at first glance, since it is impossible for a single professor to anticipate the range and variety of pupil populations with which beginning teachers will be confronted. But the basic fact remains, unfortunately, that there are few specialists in schools of education who know anything worth teaching about how to organize history, literature or biology for lower class students.

Can't the school itself and experienced teachers already there, however, help the neophyte over this difficulty? The answer is ordinarily a flat no. In the first place, as urban schools are typically organized, the beginning teacher is assigned a full teaching load and rarely sees his colleagues except for a brief nod in the corridors or for a few minutes of casual conversation in the cafeteria. Even if there were time to confer seriously with his fellows it would probably be more debilitating than useful. In many lower class schools, freer access to experienced teachers would simply shorten the time required for the beginner to water-down his courses and to resign himself to drastically lowered aspirations of what youngsters can reasonably be expected to learn. The great majority of experienced slum school teachers seem to have grown wearily pessimistic and to have concluded that personal sanity requires coming to terms with the limitations of "reality". [9]

The probability, then, that the neophyte will find real intellectual satisfaction in organizing his specialized content for teaching in lower class schools is exceedingly small. Given the deficiencies and omissions in training and the lack of support and assistance to be found in the schools what is remarkable is not that so many beginning teachers forget the excitement of learning, but that a heartening few somehow maintain a vigorous scholarship and positive attitudes towards their pupils. Unless the situation is radically re-structured the degree of intellectual reward ordinarily possible will remain depressingly small.

---

[9] Educational specialists working with New York City personnel in school improvement projects report teacher resentment towards such "helps". Projects are perceived as necessitating additional teacher time and labor without affording any compensating hope of success.

But before further considering the present likelihood of finding intellectual satisfaction in teaching in lower schools, the third ingredient of the student's preparation for teaching should be examined. As was indicated earlier, in addition to requirements in general education and in a specialized teaching field the prospective teacher is required to include study in the field of professional education. Conventional practice is to provide basically the same pattern of course work and internship experiences for all prospective teachers irrespective of the pupils they will eventually instruct. The occasional institution may offer a course in the "disadvantaged child" or the "slow learner" or in "problems of urban education," but such offerings are generally not included in preparatory programs, and, for the most part, they represent more an admission that problems exist than an accumulated body of relevant knowledge. The simple truth is that we in education know very little about how to deal with youngsters who have not already been convinced by their social backgrounds that the school is a necessary and reasonable institution. This is not to question the proximate relevance of the usual ingredients of professional training. Knowledge of the school as a social institution, of the developmental processes of children, of learning theory, and of a variety of methods for presenting material, together with carefully supervised practice in instruction, can and do make a significant contribution to effectiveness as a teacher. But the basic fact is simply that, even at its best, the normal sequence of professional studies only introduces the apprentice to an understanding of the teacher-learning process. Moreover, many institutions attempt to engage in teacher-training programs with extremely limited staff -- both quantitatively and qualitatively -- and substitute a set of platitudinous precepts for the vigorous inquiry and systematic practice which are required.

The inadequacy of collegiate training to the complex mysteries of educating lower class children is of considerable magnitude. The young beginner enters a world for which he has neither the experience nor the intellectual tools to hope to understand. He is assigned five or six classes and provided with a set of textbooks and teaching manuals just as if the tasks he faced were clearly feasible. Indeed, except perhaps for a few words of special advice from the principal, the school routines he meets are almost exactly identical to those used in middle class schools everywhere. In essence, he is greeted with essentially fraudulent external assurances that all is well and smoothly functioning. But what he too frequently finds beneath a very thin surface is a pervasive sense of failure, resignation, and despair.

What are the psychic rewards open to the beginning teacher in such a situation? There may be, eventually, the satisfaction of having conquered fear, or the sense of power from discovering how to keep the classroom physically intact, or the felling of self-mastery associated with achieving an uneasy personal adjustment in a disordered world. But except for the rare intuitively gifted individual, the intellectual satisfactions presumably inherent in teaching are almost non-existent in slum schools. Intellectual satisfactions arise primarily from the ordering if not the resolution of problems, and there can be little reward in working with dilemmas not yet even defined.

If the teacher's prospects are in fact so dismal, the essential need in further quality and equality in education is the deliberate creation of new intellectual outlets for teachers -- the development of new reward patterns. Almost everyone concedes that teaching is or should be an intellectual calling -- an occupation emphasizing the transmission of intellectual goods and the use of intelligence in making instructional decisions. But despite such consensus we have been scandalously less than imaginative in structuring our slum schools to free the full power of the teacher's mind. The goal of providing for equality and quality is of such complexity and of such difficulty of attainment that it may not be feasible to conceive of slum schools simply as places of instruction. Some of them perhaps must also be centers of inquiry -- producers as well as transmitters of knowledge. The basic fact is our ignorance; we simply don't know how to entice the elusive intellects of lower class children, let alone how to achieve the mastery of abstract knowledge and analytical skills modern society demands. It may well be necessary to transform at least some schools into centers for the production of knowledge about how to carry out the job. In brief, if we are to meet present educational responsibilities, we may have to discover a great deal more about the mysteries of human learning in various subcultures and about how intellectual values may in fact be internalized. And university schools of education alone, despite the degree to which their resources are currently being strengthened, can probably not produce the requisite new knowledge. They must be joined in the quest by lower schools especially organized for the task of inquiring.

The obstacles which an existing school would have to overcome to achieve such a transformation are, of course, enormous. Crucial to any change would be school administrators of sufficient courage, or perhaps Mayer's term is more apt, of sufficient wit to understand and to admit publicly that the urban school is ordinarily an outrageous failure. To cease behaving as if all that was required was more of the same -- the kind of facilities, teachers, learning materials, and instructional routines which have seemed to suffice in middle class schools -- would provide a notable beginning. For educators to drop the essentially buck-passing assertion that the heart of the problem is society's unwillingness to pay for "better" teachers would be an even more desirable development. Even the most affluent society has the right and the responsibility to ask schoolmen what capabilities are required, and, if the requisitely qualified teachers are recruited, how can their competence be sustained in the actual school setting.

There is considerable seeming safety in pleading for more of the same. Any degree of public investment, since "more" is a conveniently elastic term, can be rationalized as insufficient to the task. There is, on the other hand, grave apparent danger to the administrator's reputation as an expert to admit ignorance and to request funds to investigate problems. The first obstacle to be overcome, therefore, if any school is to become a center of inquiry is the fear of revealing how little we know. But such an ill-kept secret cannot be closeted indefinitely and continued public concern about urban education will undoubtedly make it more dangerous for educators to feign wisdom than to demand a search for knowledge.

Such a demand,once widely enunciated, might easily gain impressive momentum. The problems of urban education are inherently fascinating. Teachers have not been freed to study issues dispassionately, however, but have had to bear a heavy burden of guilt for being unable to resolve problems which, according to the implicit expectations of official school appointments, require no special analysis or talent. If assignments to slum schools were to be structured so as to combine the investigation of tough problems with on-going teaching efforts, the psychic rewards available to individual instructors might be enormously increased. Many able young people could presumably be attracted to a situation which afforded opportunities for increased power and control of one's performance. What seems most enervating about teaching in urban schools is not the severity of the difficulties encountered but the powerlessness of the individual to further his effectiveness.

To make it possible for teachers to approach their work in the spirit of inquiry would of course necessitate a drastic reduction of teaching loads. Schools are ordinarily conceived as educational dispensaries -- apothecary shops charged with the distribution of information and skills deemed useful for the social, vocational and intellectual health of the young. Embedded in this dominant conception of the school as a dispensary is the notion that teaching, since it is thought to consist basically of dispersing packaged information, is an essentially easy, routine and sub-professional task. Accordingly, it seems perfectly reasonable to the public, to school boards, and even to many administrators that teachers should teach all day. For the apothecary to fill prescriptions during his working hours is not considered overly burdensome; why then should the purveyor of information be unduly tired from a shorter school day? Teaching, it is often assumed, provides a sinecure -- short hours, frequent holidays, and a long summer vacation.

Such a stereotype obscures the harsh realities of the teacher's daily schedule. He is obligated to be in school for seven or eight hours and the vast proportion of this time is claimed by activities involving other persons -- classes, conferences, faculty meetings, corridor and lunchroom duty, etc. It is doubtful that any occupation demands as continuous, intensive, and exhausting personal interactions as does teaching in the lower schools. The time which is not so consumed is at least partially devoted to clerical and administrative routines such as keeping attendance, organizing collections, maintaining records for report cards, and funneling data to the central office. For even the moderately conscientious teacher this schedule is lengthened by the necessity of using weekends and evenings for lesson planning, correcting papers and completing similar chores. It is difficult to imagine that the public could condone such a work load if it conceived of teaching as anything other than the routine transmission of elementary information. Even those persons who might wish to reflect seriously about their own teaching or to seek systematic means of improving their performance are in large degree prevented from doing so by the sheer pressure of the teaching schedule. When it is remembered that in urban schools personal interactions normally involve frequent expressions of hostility, or what is worse, abject apathy, the emotional drain of the job is apparent. For a school to be organized as a center of inquiry would necessitate teaching loads no more than a third to a half than normally carried.

In addition, if slum schools are to be made intellectually exciting institutions -- places where youngsters are not only pressured to learn a little of what is known but where adults also investigate matters not yet understood -- some members of the teaching staffs will have to be especially prepared. A considerable sophistication in the behavioral sciences, irrespective of individual teaching fields, would seem essential. But, as Shaplin has pointed out, teaching normally attracts persons of humanistic and literary as opposed to scientific outlook. He states:

> "One of the great hazards of the teaching profession is the selection into teaching, by the culture, of non-quantitatively oriented people. We all know of our difficulties in recruiting teachers of mathematics and science; but not so apparent is the real distaste, fear or helplessness in the face of quantiative, scientific, mathematical analysis which characterizes a vast majority of our elementary and secondary school teachers. This orientation includes the scientific aspects of the behavioral sciences as well. Partly this is due to the feminization of the teaching staff of the lower schools, for it is well known that girls at all levels of schooling in general respond relatively poorly to mathematical and scientific training and themselves perpetuate the cycle when they become teachers; but it is also due to the fact that students with mathematical and scientific aptitude are selected for other occupations at all levels of our educational system. Graduates of liberal arts colleges coming into teaching pride themselves on their humanistic, non-quantitative, non-behavioral aesthetic values. Courses in educational psychology with a scientific bent in measurement and statistics and in educational research are characteristically disliked at the outset, before the instructors add to the emotional attitudes by massacre." 10

The staffing needs of a school committed to inquiry would necessitate behavioral studies far more advanced than those which teachers now in training typically find distasteful. Even though recruiting and training new teachers would require unusual effort, as Shaplin has suggested, identifying practicing teachers prepared to add to knowledge about teaching would be even more difficult. For it is primarily colleges and universities, not in the schools themselves, that interest in scientific investigations of teaching has dramatically increased. The publication of the "Handbook on Research in Teaching", the spectacularly increased if still modest budget of the Cooperative Research Bureau, the push for systematic classroom analysis among curriculum specialists, and even the appearance of well-financed Research and Development Centers have created little stir among

---

[10] Judson Shaplin, "Practice in Teaching", in Smith, Elmer R., editors, TEACHER EDUCATION: A REAPPRAISAL, Harper and Row, New York, 1962, p. 103.

practitioners. The language, tools of inquiry and the conceptualizations employed in investigations of teaching are professionally shared by psychologists, social psychologists and specialists in educational research and almost not at all by teachers. Instructors in the lower schools ordinarily do not possess a working technical vocabulary or set of concepts and propositions on teaching sufficiently precise to be shared in professional association. The absence of codified knowledge shared by teachers robs them of the psychic rewards associated with expertise in the advancement of knowledge. A practitioner feels removed from the activities of educational research and rarely perceives himself as having any stake in its development. He is fully occupied with the daily business of keeping school and is effectively deprived of the opportunity to reflect systematically upon his experience.

Assuming, doggedly, that teachers interested in behavioral analysis could nonetheless be recruited and trained, there would still be difficulties to resolve. As earlier mentioned, the heritage of American schools is highly egalitarian and there is little developed tradition for deliberately differentiated training and assignment of instructional personnel. Teachers are ordinarily conceived of as sergeants in the same army, equal in power and in influence, each sovereign in his own classroom, and each carrying essentially equal responsibilities. It is true that larger systems employ supporting personnel -- supervisors, curriculum consultants, subject-matter specialists, et al.-- but such persons have ordinarily escaped from the classroom and no longer engage in direct relationships with pupils. It is also true that some team teaching arrangements envisage differentiated teaching assignments, but usually particular responsibility within a team is based upon experience and amount of preparation more than upon sharply different kinds of training. To develop even a few schools as centers of inquiry would necessitate breaking the normal tendency for what has been called "democratic regression" among teachers, and encouraging the acceptance of specialized persons who continue to function only on part-time as classroom instructors.

Even if all obstacles were successfully overcome -- the necessity for investigation recognized, teachers recruited and trained, additional costs absorbed, egalitarian traditions submerged, and specialized supporting personnel provided -- schools organized as centers of inquiry would probably make no discoveries of consequence for many years. How to induce more lower class youngsters to grapple zestfully with academic issues may elude the most determined efforts. But I strongly suspect that observing adults honestly wrestling with intellectual problems might win more youngsters to the life of the mind than any other experience the schools could devise. And even if youngsters remained unresponsive, teachers in urban schools, at least, would achieve the kind of quality and equality in education to which this conference aspires.

SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS

by

Robert Schaefer

I don't think I have much to add of anything to the paper. I might summarize it very briefly. I began by reaffirming a faith in multiple causation and the complexity of this problem; I then indicated some of what I call the external rewards which are available to teachers and concluded that in the central cities these rewards of money, of prestige and the fringe benefits are somewhat less than they are normally. I then talked about the variety of motives which influence individual teachers on what they are seeking in the role, the conclusion generally being that teaching in the central cities affords little reward for most people and that there are possibly two general approaches to the situation: one is to get some high level of energy, enthusiasm and charismatic leadership. I think this is represented, for example, in St. Louis by Sam Shepard and his group, working on the problem actively, energetically.

Another variation of the same thing is to try to set up schools where you look at the problem frankly as wide open, and you admit and feel confident that no one knows anything about this. The thing to do is to look at it, and to inquire about it, and change the atmosphere of the school from one that's doing a job, as if it could be done, to one that's trying to do a job and is wide open as to how you do it.

That's essentially what I've said. I guess I will find out more what I've said when I listen to the respondents.

DISCUSSION
by
Judson Shaplin

Looking at our first point; that is, the flow of occupational movement of talented teachers, I think the evidence is pretty clear that teachers follow the same avenues of social mobility that the population in general follows; that is, we have a movement from rural and small town to urban areas, and with urban areas to select schools and select communities, and the smaller, less prestigeful institutions of training feed directly into the elite schools and the elite communities. This pattern is pretty well-established and pretty fundamental.

There is another pattern which I would label as a provincial pattern which has always been strong in education and is at the base of much of our certification regulation. Much of the political interference with the schools arises from the desire of locals to stay locals and teach where they live; this is a prevailing pattern in the large cities at the moment and creates a great many problems.

Now, as we go through another cultural phase and what seem to be new and difficult tasks emerge to public visibility, the basic question that poses itself to me is: can we expect the members of a depressed profession who follow this social mobility pattern, to do the job with our talented teachers concentrated in our best schools? Can we expect them to move over into essentially more difficult, less rewarding situations, to take on the social jobs which we see as having to be done at the moment? I personally think not. I don't think we can expect this.

I think we can expect a better job from people in their positions wherever they are, and this is a question partly of leadership. But I don't think we can expect a massive move-over, the massive expression of social conscience from a depressed profession.

Taking another point, I think there are certain institutional barriers to recruitment; that is, we in education are bound to a limited pool of limited talent for our leadership. This pool is the fully-certified teacher who has gone through teacher training exercises in the colleges and universities. And there are deadening entry points. In other words, within the prestige system of the universities, programs of teacher-training are low on the totem pole. Even though in the occupational structure the teacher outside, as viewed by others, may be high up, it's low down on the totem pole within the colleges and universities. There is limited visibility of specialized positions and there is limited visibility to the college students of the leadership requirements in education.

There is also an over-long apprenticeship before one can move into any kind of leadership, and it is a deadening apprenticeship, because for most part it is spent in schools of one kind under poor leadership.

Now I think Bob Schaefer in his paper stays within this pool -- this is what he is talking about -- and if somehow there is an expectation that we are going to recruit, from within this, people who have some behavioral science background who will study the problem, I just don't have confidence in this pool and I think we need cross-over channels for highly talented persons to enter education.

From business, from engineering, from law, from whatever other professions, people who decide they are in something they don't like, people who have a natural feeling for teaching, who want to instruct others, right now they are barred from entry, and we have over-long training and awkward training situations to bring them in. And we've got to attack this problem and make it possible for cross-over.

Leaving out the highly talented -- I'm such a person -- moving over from anthropology and psychology into education at the university level, by present certification requirements, I can't work in the school, although I have devoted seventeen years of my life to it.

Going on to another point, I think the discussion in many of the papers, several papers, perhaps all of the papers, has tended to narrow our conception of equality. Each paper ends up with conceptions and problems of the culturally deprived before it finishes, and Schaefer does this as he comes to the end of his paper.

I'd like to protest that we are not only thinking about lower class and culturally-deprived people, but we are thinking about the disadvantaged in other senses when we talk about equality of opportunity. This is clearest in Mr. Kirk's paper, when he talks about the various types of developmental difficulties that kids can have, and it becomes particularly poignant when we think of the talented in other areas than academic areas within the schools. After all, three-quarters of every class in every class must stand below the top quarter, and within every family it's rare indeed that all children distribute themselves in the top quarter of their class.

Now, during the whole recent decade or more when I was trained in the Lloyd Warner era of sociology, anthropology and Yankee City, that whole period of sociology which was aiming at the kinds of differences within the schools and within society by class, and all during this recent social and cultural emphasis upon the gifted, I've asked myself: when will the countervailing power exert itself; that is, the deep egalitarian impulses in American society and the pressure from the majority of parents who don't have gifted children, when will this exert itself?

As I see it being exerted, I see that it is coming asymmetrically; in other words, it's coming from a sense of urgent problems such as the culturally deprived, and partly because of the peculiar orientation of our own recent president, it comes very heavily in special education, mentally retarded, and so on, as expressed in legislation.

These are the areas where the federal government is putting forward or is expected to put forward money in large amounts. The great middle ground of so-called mediocrity, which the gifted programs claim that the whole school systems were organized for, the center for the great broad band of the mediocre in a mediocre program, is being passed by. I don't happen to believe that, because I believe the American schools have always concentrated on the college preparatory and this myth of the schools focussed to the middle, mediocre middle, I just don't believe that myth.

Another point, looking now at the culturally deprived, I am impressed by certain things. I am impressed by the experiential and linguistic deficits about which we are beginning to get a clearer idea because of recent work and studies and programs.

Following Kirk again, I am very much impressed with the extent of developmental retardation of a highly technical nature requiring highly technical diagnosis and highly technical treatment, and I am impressed, putting the two together, cultural deficit and developmental deficit, that these fit. So there is an enormous problem here requiring the highest technical skill in areas where we know something but not enough -- but we do know something. And I'm impressed by this.

I'm impressed by the process of alienation in the schools. Kids who have deficits get beaten up intellectually, socially, emotionally in our schools, and they are cast off and rejected.

Now, I'm impressed by the intractability of the product, of the cast-off product. At 16 what can you do with him? He is so intractable at this point, been alienated so by the normal school arrangements. These students are impervious to any kind of group process, group teaching process, anything that we would normally consider as schooling.

I am impressed that the break-throughs seem to come with highly individualized treatment. If you look at the progress in social work, the neighborhood workers who seem to have made some impact, you look at the tutorial programs that seem to be making some impact, at the counseling researching which shows a man-to-man relationship of a very highly personal developmental sense, I am impressed by the intractability and the enormous work needed to retrieve someone.

And then I'm impressed again by the societal barriers to adjustment of these kids, and here is the whole problem that we really haven't worked out very well, the relationship between entering employment and entering the military forces, and we let these two markets play off against each other, and we leave 16 to 18 to 20 year olds hanging in the air for a couple of years. The employers won't employ them until they have their service over. So what can they do? And they can't get in the service if they have any kind of deprivation. The military has lost the function of taking the deprived and training them, the point which Martin Mayer made.

Now, all this adds up to my person whose career is devoted to the schools being impressed with the need for out-of-school instruction. We see this developing now in a rather chaotic fashion -- pre-schools by voluntary groups; special schools for alienated youth are not very successful if they are within institutional schools; again done by voluntary group, by social agencies, by a whole welter of activities, the job corps kind of proposition from the federal government -- the peculiarity of the poverty program is that they are really not about to support regular school institutions.

I see there is nothing for formal education in the poverty program, because they are not going to put any money -- I suppose it's the religious factor, I suppose it's "agin" the federal aid spectre, but there is nothing, nothing for the public schools in the poverty program. There will be no way of strengthening the public schools through that program.

Now, I think that these out-of-school institutions have to be institutionalized for the long haul. The settlement houses really never got institutionalized in this way -- little private foundations struggling along. Are we headed down this road? Is it to be in school or out of school? How is it to get public tax money at the local level? Federal pressure is placing these programs outside the schools and going to make connections with the schools difficult.

Without local institutions, local financing, some way of getting into the public dollar, the question then will be: how long can they be sustained and how long can voluntary interests do it?

Let me take a little more time for the issue of who is going to do the work in building new connections between education and social work, other agencies, volunteer adults and students. There is an increased interest, a fashionable interest on the part of psychologists and sociologists. I consider this a great boon to education. Those people in institutional education need every bit of help that they can get from any source of society.

I think that this creates a whole great new pool for recruitment for us. Somehow we have to find ways of taking those who demonstrate ability and bring them into careers in this work. I don't have any clear image of how this can be done, but I see the target. These are people we want in education and we've got to institutionalize their entry because they can't do it on an ad hoc basis. Much of social work has suffered because of this. They have to have salaries and rewards.

I think that Schaefer's paper sees the formal profession as doing the job. I don't see it that way at all. I see para-professional institutions and a new corps of workers, new people doing the job, and I am worried about how we can organize this for long-term work, how to make connections with the schools, how to capitalize on what is learned, how to encourage the new recruits to attack our problems, and how to systematize and rationalize the whole new structure. I'm worried about the way in which the federal government is intervening illogically.

Now, let's take up the question of what do we know. Schaefer assumes that we know little. I am not going to make that assumption. We have been working on this with intensity for five to ten years now, with increasing intensity in recent years, but they are age-old problems. We have always had a culturally deprived. It's in different locations in different parts of the country. My whole professional career has had a succession of differing loci of this deprivation and the kinds of things to do about it. A lot of serious work has been done over a long time. It's not all called formal education, and it's not all in the educational literature; it's in a scattered literature.

But I am particularly impressed by the change in my own thinking which has occurred as a result of the work of the last five years and of the last year; that is, I think we can see certain directions and we need to systematize a growing body of information. It's fairly chaotic, it's not in the university tradition yet; it's not done with the sense of scientific and formal evaluation that we can have great confidence in.

I think that Mr. Shepard's work in St. Louis has shown that you can stimulate parents' interest in their children's progress, that you can get their involvement and they will do things, that you can affect the family environment. I think his work has shown that you can organize teachers and principals to get a significant response and new intensity of effort. They are willing to work. I think this work has shown that children respond eagerly if this kind of interest is shown in their work.

I think the same kind of thing has been shown in the Higher Horizons Program, which is older. Sam Shepard has been working for at least five years in this program, and Higher Horizons still longer, before its dilution on egalitarian principles to the whole city. This work has to be focussed; it can't be watered down to nothing.

In the pre-school movement now we get something that the whole nursery school movement of the past 20 years hasn't given us. Now we are beginning to get some concrete analysis of the meaning of lack of experience and some concrete understanding of the meaning of deficit in language development. This is emerging in the literature and it's something we are beginning to know something about.

I think that Kirk's work illustrates, as I said before, the tremendously difficult technical problems, but again there is a whole range of approaches.

I am impressed with the work of Schuler at Hunter College in a program for training teachers for culturally deprived areas. I haven't seen the school, but I believe the whole character of a junior high school in New York City has been changed by the introduction and staying within that new system of a new crop of teachers recruited and trained in it.

In a number of places professionals as well as volunteers are now working on new materials directed toward particular social problems. There are new readers, and so on.

Now we have the problem that clearing houses of information are necessary. No one man can find all of the things that are being done. It is, as I said, a chaotic arrangement. It has a frenetic quality. But I would insist we are not ignorant.

Now let me turn to the notion of inquiry school. I agree in principle but I disagree in terms of pace and the job to be done. The children can't wait for research of the long-term variety. I'm more a social reformer than a scientist; I'll admit that freely. They have only one life to live and we've got to do something now, so that I am for action research.

And this brings me to the behavioral sciences. I'm with Schaefer and not with Mayer's comments of last night, but I place peculiar demands upon the social scientists who are going to work with these problems.

I suppose after my work in team teaching in which I attempted to get behavioral scientists to work on the design and evaluation of team teaching projects that I ought not to be completely cynical about behavioral scientists because they can't contribute. They have been able to contribute very little. But perhaps the problem wasn't significant enough. We need behavioral scientists of the type who in the past have devoted their lives to such persistent problems as crime and delinquency, where they have actually worked in prisons; social welfare, where they have actually worked in agencies; health, where they have actually worked in hospitals, where they are willing to undertake management of programs that are not just research but also action. Sociologists, psychologists, anthropologists are engaged in this kind of work in many areas but infrequently in education. I don't think we have much room for the behavioral scientists who just wants to study the problem on a long-term basis.

We want behavioral scientists, I think, who will join us as new members of the team to help direct, who will do field experiments, and by field experiments they will undertake action programs which they study in process, with all of the multiple, difficult, outrageous number of variables that are involved.

Now, I haven't attempted to deal with what I think is another deficiency of the paper. It's called "The Recruitment and Training of Schoolmen," and the paper says practically nothing about training. I think this probably reflects his and my tiredness with the whole criticism of training that's gone on for so many years now and the amount of energy which we have put into this kind of thing. I hope the whole conference will concentrate upon the problem of how much of training has generality or is of a general nature that focuses broadly and how much is specific, focussed on the urgent problems.

When I look at Kirk's problem, then I begin to think about very highly technical training. How many in the elementary schools know one darn little thing about the kind of developmental difficulties that he is talking about and trying to remedy, and yet before them are the kids everyday in the classroom.

DISCUSSION
by
Theodore Sizer

I'd like to first look at a couple of points which I thought were pretty good in Bob Schaefer's paper and elaborate on them and save most of my time to concentrate on one particular point where I think a greater emphasis is needed. I think it's useful to look at a couple of these points and highlight them, as some of them are not as emphasized in the paper as they might be.

Very good is the paper's recognition that there is little difference between the rewards, the salary rewards as well as the psychic rewards between the newcomer and the person about to retire. People say teachers' salaries have gone up. If you look carefully, the rise has been largely with the novice teacher. And this is fine. You get the person for three years. But what this foreshortened reward system does for the person aiming for a career should be obvious, indeed.

Second, Bob makes the very obvious point which most of us have forgotten for generations, and that is that teachers differ just as children do. It's always ironic that you take masses of prospective teachers and put them in great big lecture halls, lecture to them all the time about how children differ and how when you get into your classroom you must teach kids differently, and then we train all the teachers in the same way. Teachers do differ. They should be trained differently. They should be handled differently in the schools. To assume that every teacher has the same qualities to provide in each classroom is palpably absurd.

And the point I think that Bob makes is a good one.

Third, I think he puts his finger on a very important point when he says that our enterprise, our efforts so far have been to try to get better people into the schools rather than trying to change the intellectual climate of the schools, to keep these better people alive and do better by those who are already there.

One of the most depressing things, I think, for those of us who are involved in recruiting and training able people for the schools is to see what happens to too many of them five, ten years out -- the system closes in on them and their minds close in, and you wonder where that bushy-tailed, able fellow was that you knew ten years previous.

Fourth, a phrase he uses which, I think, puts his finger on one aspect of training -- I think we should talk a bit about training -- Bob says that reflection must be applied to the psychological translation of content. The concern here is how you take a discipline and translate it, if you will, into something that makes sense for this particular group of children in this particular city.

Now, I would argue that this problem is not only psychological, though psychological in part it clearly is. Much of this translation has to do with the structure of the discipline itself, the inherent logic of the subject, and it seems to me that this point is too often overlooked.

The selection or translation of what is taught requires a grasp of the logic of the subject in a way that makes it possible for a child to learn sequentially. This is a point that, of course, John Dewey called method in 1916; Jerome Bruner now calls it structure -- it's really the same thing. But it raises an interesting question, I think, about much of the present argument in the training of teachers. Is the selection problem, which is the most sophisticated problem, I think, that a prospective teacher faces -- how he translates, how he selects from his discipline what the child would learn -- is this education, is it pedagogy, is it in this case, let us say, history? Where does the line between pedagogy and the logic of the discipline break off? Where does subject matter stop and education start?

It seems to me it underscores the absurd weakness of this poliarity we have had between subject matter versus education. The two are so fundamentally intertwined you cannot get them apart, and the longer we talk about the polarities, let's get people from this side and that side, the more absurd it gets.

In my experience, the most profound training in the subject that our students get is to teach. There is no better crucible for the future historian than to teach history, because he hits history in a way he never had before. And to call practice teaching purely pedagogy is absurd. It should be seen as a working-out, a fundamental working-out of the subject, whatever the subject can be.

So when Bob says in passing, reflection must be applied to the psychological translation of content, I'd want to underline that in red to say that it is a much more complex problem than simply psychological and that by looking at the problem in this way, some of this absurd polarity that we have been accustomed to will disappear.

And, finally, I like Bob's humility when he says we don't know much, but I would rather come down a bit more on Jud's side of the fence. I think our problem is that we know little but our greater problem is we haven't even acted on the little we know.

We say a great deal in conferences of this kind about differences, cultural differences, individual differences, and we have been saying this same sort of thing for well on forty years in different ways, but our school systems have yet to act on this in any effective way. And the problem is how to get the ideas which we can agree on translated into something that works.

Again, here is this problem, the problem of the whole progressive era in the twentieth century -- the rhetoric is up here and the practice is down here. And the extent to which rhetoric did not affect the practice has been very much misunderstood.

Well, so much for pointing out these few points that I have wanted to emphasize. I'd like to turn in considerably more detail to, again, one phrase in the paper and I will make the dangerous assumption that I can put aside for a moment the question of the details of what we mean by equality and inequality of education, and I would like to turn, rather, to given programs, given ideas. How are we going to get these into the life-blood of the educational system?

There is a double-barreled problem here. There is the problem of what to do; there is the problem of how to do it. You can't look at the two separately.

Bob in his beginning remarks talks about a comment of Martin's about the level of wit of the educational establishment, and he brushes it off, saying he doesn't want to have us look at the level of wit of educationists. I think that's wrong. It seems to me this is a very good place to start, this looking at the level of the wit of educationists, because while someone, I forget who it was, last night said there is no single major catalyst to educational reform, I would suggest to you that there is, among the cluster of important catalysts, one that stands out in my view as of highest importance, and that is the nature of this very establishment; that until the educational establishment can be depended upon, there will be no reform.

Mr. Conant, I think, in his latest book -- poor Mr. Conant gets clubbed when he is not around; I guess he gets clubbed when he is around, too, nowadays -- but his latest book disappoints me in a number of ways and excites me in others. One of the major disappointments is, again, he goes around the establishment. You cannot go around the establishment. You may not like it, and therefore the answer is not to circumvent it; it's to seize it, because willy-nilly the people who run the schools and train the teachers and who control the certification authorities who man the state departments of education in the United States Office of Education are powerful individuals and they must be some way seen as the major catalyst and dealt with accordingly, without which the establishment will see to it that nothing happens. And I'd suggest we'd better look very hard at this first problem.

Most of the discussion, not only here but in books recently -- Mr. Conant's, Jim Kerner's and others -- has been about teachers in a mass. How are we going to better train teachers? How are we going to better recruit teachers? How are we going to better hold teachers? And it seems to me this is really Question Number 2.

Question Number 1, to look at it strategically for a minute, is rather that the discussion should be about the teachers of teachers and the 10 or 15 percent of the people in the school systems who make the decisions. Because if the teachers of teachers are fifth-rate, two things will surely happen:

1. The instruction of prospective teachers will be of low quality; and

2. The bad teachers of teachers will drive away, they will not attract, the very people you want.

So, until you get powerful educationists who attract to them first-rate people, you are going to get nowhere.

Second, I look at the power structure of the schools. Far too little is known about this, I grant you, but given what we do know, it is clear that important decisions are made in the administrative hierarchy in the school systems, the key people in the states being the school superintendents , the principals, the department chairmen, and so forth. In the way we have organized our schools, teachers count for little in the making of decisions. We can deplore it -- I deplore it -- but I would suggest that the fastest way to change this is not to try to recruit more teachers and then frustrate them by putting them under less than competent superintendents.

I would suggest starting with the superintendents. You can pick out school systems in this country where there are extraordinary things going on, and where you look is the superintendent's office and the principal's office in the schools. The importance of these people is very great indeed.

One thing I very strongly object to in Schaefer's paper is when he says people leave the classroom. When a principal leaves the classroom this is a gross failure. To me a principal who is worth a damn is a principal who stays in the classroom in a very fundamental way. He may not teach 150 kids a day in 30 groups, 50 three-minute periods, but if his major focus is on instruction, it seems to me he is a teacher. And if we got men into school systems who focussed on the learning, the way children learn and how to teach them and what they are taught, these people are teachers.

And so what I'm suggesting here is let us look at the hierarchy. I am most specifically saying the hierarchy at many points should be teachers in the broadest sense.

Furthermore, if you identify these people and if you start defining administrative positions, not as administrative but as positions of educational leadership, you open up careers for people who are interested by the intellectual problems of education as well as or in exclusion of the purely administrative.

Well, what do I mean by establishment? It's defined in many, many ways. I would like to define it as those who train teachers from the professional side, though I will have just finished saying I am not sure where the line between professional and the non-professional is drawn, and the key men, the influential men in the school systems -- what do they look like? What should they look like?

The first thing to point out is that the establishment should be, and in many places is, varied. Education isn't a discipline; it isn't a subjec t. It isn't like physics. It's an enterprise. And a school of education ideally isn't like a department of physics. It's like a college where people from different points of view, coming from different academic disciplines, with different perceptions, are looking at one thing in common, and that is the same enterprise, which is education.

There is no such thing, in my view, as a professor of education pure and simple. A professor of education and what? A professor of education in what sense? We call them professors of education, but if you look under the skins of the best ones, you find that they are looking at the world from a particular point of view -- a professor of education and mathematics, a professor of education and administration. And the different points of view looking at the enterprise, it seems to me, is an important point to keep in mind.

Thus, this implies that the establishment is drawn from many disciplines; that is, it should be drawn from many disciplines, and the problems of schools of education, as the three of us can testify, is not nearly so much looking at other schools of education, other departments of education for recent graduate students as it is for looking through our whole universities for people that can be recruited to the cause.

I sit as the dean of a faculty, the majority of the members of whom hold doctorates in fields other than education, and a third of whom hold appointments in arts and sciences, as well. Is this a school of education? In the departmental sense, of course not. It's a college with linkages all over the place, with people looking in very different ways at the world. The only common element is they are looking at the same enterprise. You must assume a variation . Of course, you can extend this along.

It assumes that people coming in this enterprise are trained in very different ways. They come from very different points of view.

Having said that, the second point I'd like to make about the establishment is that educational problems are worthy of careers; that is, those who would suggest that the problems of the schools can be solved by people from other disciplines moving in and out quickly, the one-shot, hit-and-run curriculum dev elopment project, the one-shot, hit-and-run research project seem to me to kid themselves. You can't alter any part of the educational apparatus now without getting the domino effect. You can't touch junior year physics without starting all the dominoes going down, because to get junior physics, what does this imply about sophomore year mathematics and freshman year science, and so forth and so forth? What does it mean about how to train teachers? If you are going to change the physics curriculum, you bring your physicists in to do it. What does this mean for teachers, so forth and so on?

The fabric is such that you must look at it as a piece, and this means it makes it difficult for the reforms of education to be done by part-timers. I am not suggesting that part-timers aren't important or that they may not constitute the major source of reform. What I am suggesting is there has got to be a core, an establishment of first-rate people who are going to spend their lifetimes looking at the whole fabric.

Of course, there are examples to support this. For instance, take probably the most successful curriculum development project, the physical science study committee, which has had a significant impact here and abroad, but look at the concessions they have made. For instance, they ignored individual differences. Yes, I see it's aimed at one group, does very well by that group, but there are all sorts of problems which aren't considered about the nature of learning and about the differences between learners.

Second, and to me quite dangerously, it preserves the status quo. It accepts the self-contained classroom. It accepts that teachers act the way they act now. It accepts the present hierarchy. And I would suggest that such a program might have been far more effective if somehow there was an attempt to see these areas which were perceived by those working as peripheral. Of course, they perceive this now -- and this was the first one, so obviously the mistakes were made -- but hopefully such curriculum reform going forward will see the larger picture in a better way.

Really, here then I am arguing that we need an establishment absolutely, and it has to be an establishment of first-rate -- and we can call them professors of education if you want, and school superintendents, but it seems to me they have to have some of these characteristics I've suggested.

Third, and this is somewhat harder to defend, harder to describe, it seems to me that the establishment must be made up of revolutionaries. What do I mean? I really mean that as I see education and the attempts so far to change education, I am convinced that we need dynamite, we need a revolution.

When you look at the efforts again, the distance between the rhetoric of the progressive movement and the schools, particularly in the big cities, if you look at what happened in Boston in the 1920's and 1930's, the rhetoric up here, the changing of course titles and the same things going on in the schools, you begin to see that the tradition, the present system is so deeply entrenched that it's got to be moved in a radical way. And this seems to me a very important point to start from, because we find so many of our efforts now involved simply with messing with certification requirements, when the whole system, the whole assumption behind certification needs to be revised.

Do we change the law this way? Well, put that away. What do we want in the schools? Or we work on one subject. We say we'll get something going in the fine arts in the schools, without taking a step backwards and saying, what is it we want children to know about. What are the humanities in the sense of a school of one kind compared to another kind? What is the whole cluster of subjects? What does the whole curriculum mean and where, then, does the fine arts work that you are doing fit in? And you've got to break apart this notion that there are nicely boxed separate subjects in the curriculum to get any reform of any real significance.

We talk about education -- and it disturbed me a little bit last night -- we talk about education as that which goes on in schools. We know perfectly well that the informal agencies of education may be just as powerful, indeed probably are a good deal more powerful and will remain so than what the formal institutions of education can provide. We can say that that is beyond the scope of education and the schools simply must work in their own way. But I haven't seen nearly enough talk among educators about what they are doing about television, what they are doing about the mass media, about looking at the problems, about accepting certain area, certain cultural pressures in a systematic way.

Instead of having the schools simply reacting, what about trying to put these together? I don't think we can afford any longer to talk about education as simply that which goes on in schools. It's much harder to talk about it more broadly. But the efficiency with which we have learned how to educate people out of school behooves us to look at the whole picture insofar as we can.

Furthermore, we must continue to get out of the trap of the polarities which bog us -- academic versus vocational education. I've already mentioned education versus subject matter. These whipping-boys seem to be getting in the way too often of the real problems.

Finally, the problem really is, why is a revolution needed, and why must the establishment be revolutionary? The fact is that by and large education is as conservative an institution as we have, save perhaps the church, simply because education reproduces itself. It's very hard to get anything but mandarins in an educational establishment, because the very institution which trains, then hires produces its own. And people, particularly when faced with massive social problems, tend to react the way they were taught, and you get this terrible ingrown conservatism.

The key fault, it seems to me, of today's establishment is the lack of self-criticism, and it seems to me there are two ways of describing this lack of self-criticism, or explaining it:

1. that they are afraid, and

2. they don't know what to criticize because they are so much a part of it, or we are so much a part of it.

And I think I would come down as much on the latter as on the former. There has got to be some way of getting inside the establishment, as well as outside the establishment, some rough criticism.

Well, enough said. The problem, as I see it, from the recruitment and training of schoolmen point of view is to look at where the first and probably most productive point of leverage is. I think it is with the trainers of teachers and that 10 to 15 percent which make decisions in the schools, and I would start zeroing in on the recruitment and training of them in some of the ways that I have suggested here.

RESPONSE
by
Robert Schaefer

Actually I had hoped that what some of the respondents would say would sufficiently start the adrenalin flowing and that it would overcome a sluggish metabolism. But actually I can't disagree very heartily with anything that's been said. What this indicates to me is the failure of communication of a paper in certain areas.

I will respond to a few things, however, just to try to clarify what was intended.

Jud (Shaplin) remarked initially that he thought the paper was confined to a consideration of the existing pool of teachers. To a large degree this is true, except the school, conceived as a center of inquiry, certainly was not intended to let out of the picture by any means all kinds of specialists and persons from other than the traditional mill-produced teachers. In fact, it seems to me to actually inquire about the nature of learning in central cities.

My definition involves a wide range of people and talents. However, I would like to take issue with Jud's notion that within the teaching pool as currently conceived there isn't a great deal of unused talent, as Ted (Sizer) indeed remarked.

Look at New York City, for example; 80% of the teachers come from the four city colleges. The four city colleges have relatively high selection standards for admission. Yet the schools are in a great mess.

I would agree wholeheartedly with what Ted has been saying about education not being a discipline but an enterprise, a vocation or what have you, and that there is no such thing as a professor of education but rather a professor of education and psychology and history and sociology and philosophy, et cetera. He may be joined by particularly experienced practitioners working in close association, but obviously there is no such thing as a discipline of education.

In terms of a revolution required, I would wholeheartedly agree with the tone of what Ted was saying, that indeed revolution is required. But if you look at the actual demands of the school, the revolution could very well start right there in the classroom. It may require the leadership and the imagination of particularly able persons to get it started. But the sheer bulk of having to teach five or six classes a day, with a set of textbooks, on the assumptions that this is a plausible enterprise seems to me utterly ridiculous.

If you drop the pretense here and look at this as a center of asking questions about it, having time to reflect about either the structure of history or the psychologizing of the curriculum, and to tackle these kinds of problems in groups and individually on a much reduced teaching day, that would indicate some of the possibility of a great revolution.

Agreed, the enterprise needs radical revision.

ADDITIONAL QUERIES AND COMMENTS

Sidney Hook: I want to begin with a remark on Dean Sizer's observation that we must commence with the trainers of teachers in order to introduce the necessary reforms. I think we have to begin further back. The trainers of teachers already presupposes that you have your students in teaching colleges or teaching institutes. But where do those students come from?

We will predict that most of them will come from liberal arts colleges. But now if you examine the attitude of the people in liberal arts colleges to education and to schools of education, you will find that, to put it mildly, it's not one of great trust. Sometimes it is expressed in a very contemptuous attitude.

The result is that the schools of education often get rejects from the liberal arts colleges of those students who are not able enough to enter graduate schools and specialize in subject matter.

Now, this calls attention to the importance of using the liberal arts college as a recruiting ground for top-flight people in education. Part of the reason that the people in academic institutions are critical of schools of education is that they maintain they are trying to teach subject matter which is primarily the concern of the liberal arts college. And unless I misunderstood the drift of what was said this morning, it seemed to be some confirmation of the view that the teachers' colleges ought really to teach subject matter as well as methods of teaching, and that you can't make a distinction between the two.

It's perfectly clear to me that a man can know his subject matter and still not know how to teach it. In fact, there is a great presumption on the part of the academic colleges today, now that teachers' colleges are under attack, that they can take over the teaching job and that anybody who knows anything can teach it.

As most of you are aware, or should be aware, the worst teaching in the country takes place on the liberal arts level. There is absolutely no training for people who teach liberal arts, and the odd situation today that we confront is that the people in teachers' colleges are being severely criticized by those, who, themselves, have no professional preparation for teaching. And one wonders, then, how this revolution is going to begin.

I think I would agree that if you want to recruit teachers today, because of the competitive market you've got to appeal to a certain idealism. You've got to appeal to the things that we used to appeal to in the past, when we recruited physicians, before they were so highly paid. To succeed in doing that, you've got to change the attitude of the academic liberal arts colleges and find outstanding members of the faculty who regard teaching as one of the most important vocations of our time.

In this connection I really was puzzled by hearing it said this morning so often that education is not a subject matter; it's not even a discipline. Well, in one sense, of course, it isn't any specific subject matter. True, education is an art and surely we know something about it and surely we can teach it effectively, even if we regard education as an art -- music is an art, too -- but there are ways and means of effective teaching.

When I occasionally visit classes of people in my department, and I do with great trepidation because, as you know, in liberal arts colleges there is a taboo against things of that sort, though sometimes they ask me to come and watch them, I am simply aghast at what takes place in these classes -- the inability to organize material, the failure to even know when a successful lesson had been completed.

Of course, you have to be very flexible. This reminds me of the definition of education that we used to hear about years ago: Mark Hopkins on one end of the log and a student on the other, and teaching takes place by free association.

There are various ways of teaching subjects. The secret of good teaching is motivation and the arousing of motivation, but you can't do it merely by going to a classroom and improvising.

I am a little astonished that professional educators should suggest that all you do is recruit a good man and put him in a classroom. Well, of course, some people are natural-born teachers, just as some people are natural-born singers. But in my own experience I've discovered that teachers who couldn't even keep discipline in a class, and didn't know how to prevent the students from running away with a discussion, when told there were certain methods and techniques, learned how to use these.

What struck me, however, is that in the schools of education the teaching doesn't seem to be much better than the teaching in academic colleges. It's almost like what I heard in speech departments throughout the country. By some law which I don't understand, almost all the teachers in speech department don't know how to speak. I mean you are not impressed. They never teach by example, and speech, I suppose, is one of those things which should be taught more by example than by precept.

Somehow or other there is not enough interest in the actual psychology of teaching and a sense of failure to realize how important communication is.

I have heard -- I won't identify the institutions or the men from these institutions -- wonderfully organized lectures which nobody in the class understood. No one could dispute the fact that the man was a master of his subject. But he had absolutely no notion of whether he was getting a response from his class.

Now, these are commonplaces. But somehow or other I think they do challenge the attitudes that have been expressed in some of the remarks made this morning, and I wonder what response you would make.

Theodore Sizer: I am a little flabbergasted by what you inferred about what Bob(Schaefer)called translation and which I call selection. Translation, it seems to me, is the

art and craft of teaching. I wouldn't go so far as to say there is a person who can specialize in teaching per se. It seems to me the most difficult, sophisticated and demanding job of the prospective teacher is to get from Point A, what his discipline is, to the kid, Point B. It's the major job of the school of education to take part in this translation.

Maybe I didn't make clear what we meant by translation. I think this is what you are talking about.

Hook: I do want to stress the fact that there is a distinction between what we might call the mastery of the subject and the subject matter and the ability to communicate. A man can know a great deal and not be able to teach well. A man may know very little about a subject and teach brilliantly. Some of the most successful teachers of science that I know of in high schools and colleges have not made theoretical contributions of the first importance to their subject, but they have been interested in the student, and that's a very important thing.

Of course, people have made fun of progressive education because they said: we teach a child and not only a subject matter. What they meant by that was that we teach a subject matter by studying the child so that we can effectively communicate as much as he can assimilate.

This failure to pay attention to the process of education seems to me to mark a good deal of what we do, especially on the liberal arts level.

I remember being asked by some teacher -- I made suggestions somehow or other he wasn't getting across -- he said, "How do you know I am not getting across? I mean this is a puny subjective judgment."

I said, "Well, I think I know when you are getting across. When you have had a successful lesson you have left your students in a state where they will pursue the subject outside of the classroom. How often do they do that? What evidence have you got that they do that?"

He says, "Yes, well, maybe."

"Well, how do you manage to do it" And he had no notion how to do that.

Now, I think schools of education ought not to concentrate so much on the teaching of subject matter -- you presuppose that a man knows his subject matter ; but that you concentrate on the methods of inspiring teachers and making them or trying to develop them so they can inspire their students. But to stress the research in subject matters in schools of education, let that be done by others.

Robert Schaefer: It seems to me that the lower schools and the liberal arts colleges have the same attitude. The attitude basically is that teaching is easy. In the colleges you assume it's easy if you know what you are talking about and you know a discipline. In the schools you assume it's easy and it's quite possible to teach all day without reflecting upon the nature of the process or what has happened to the kids you are working with, or having the time to worry about the structure of knowledge or the psychologizing of it, or what have you. You teach all day, the whole damn day.

So we make verbal statements in teacher education institutions about the desirability of thinking seriously and reflectively about teaching, but the actual setting doesn't permit you to do this.

Hook: I wonder whether that comparison really is valid. I think you are doing an injustice to what goes on in the elementary schools. It may be that a teacher gets tired after teaching five or six classes. But when he is teaching fractions or when he is teaching percentages, he knows there are various methods that he could use, and he tries them out. Or, when he is teaching languages, he knows there is a way of getting participation of the class by using various types and kinds of materials. He knows a great deal if he's been properly taught.

Even in terms of one's experience, you can be very helpful in developing principles of pedagogy. But on the college level that's not true at all. If you ask somebody what's the best way of teaching Kant, he says -- well, he might say: you ask the students what he thinks and you tell him what you think and that's how you teach Kant. Well, of course, there is no set way of teaching Kant.

How do you know you have taught him properly? I should say on the college level anything goes and nobody cares, because your honor depends upon your research.

Judson Shaplin: I am literally shocked by your presentation that the school of education is where we should have inspiration and method. I mean, what is method? One of the greatest weaknesses of education is that psychologists try to develop general principles without application to the specific situation which someone could learn, and therefore they make the very great mistake of never bringing their work to any fruition for the practitioner.

And similarly someone who is to talk about method, how can he talk about method separately from the knowledge to be transmitted? And this is a very critical intellectual exercise that has to go on.

You highlighted the very greatest weaknesses now of the schools of education, department of education; that is, that they are composed of people who literally can't do anything. They can talk about teaching, but not about teaching anything.

I think there is a force in all our arguments this morning, that it takes good people to do this and we are looking for them, and it takes a variety of people from many disciplines to do it, and you can't make a school of education without an interest and concentration upon what is to be taught.

On the college side, I share your feelings. I think there is a natural reluctance. We in professional education don't overnight turn into the critics of the people upon whom we depend for our existence. I am waiting as an Educator or an Educationist for the professors of liberal arts to criticize themselves. I have enough work to do, without taking on the colleges.

Now, there is a wide ferment in the St. Louis area that wants to make me the reformer of the colleges and of the universities, and so on. I think maybe a complex of things is happening that will bring about some kind of reform, but it's going to be under very great difficulty.

In other words, the universities and colleges are now facing the problems that the schools have faced since World War II. There is an enormous growth and there is a shortage of personnel, and they are going to be complicated by larger classes and less qualified people, and there is going to be and is an enormous dissatisfaction building up with what happens to kids who go through the colleges and universities, and this is going to increase. And out of this spirit and groundswell of dissatisfaction we may get some kind of reform.

If I undertake to criticize the liberal arts colleges in the state of reform that you suggest, as a social reformer that you suggest, I would stop being able to work where I live.

Boris Ford: May I just pick up two connected points.

I suppose you are talking in this country -- we would not talk in England -- about the nature of the conservatism of the teaching profession. I think it's possible, I wouldn't know, that the English teacher is by a whole series of processes of recruitment and history more petty, bourgeois and conservative than your own, but I don't think the comparison matters here. He has emerged out of a social grouping whose grasp upon prestige in his segment of the community is very slight and he is constantly, I think, nervous of his social position and anxious to establish himself.

Now, I take this simply to be a fact with us, and you can't gainsay it. And the question of trying to recruit a whole teaching profession overnight from just some totally different section of the community is an attractive topic for discussion but hardly one for practical legislational policies. We just have to deal with the extremely conservative teaching profession that we have.

Any examination of the proceedings of the National Union of Teachers is depressing in the extreme, I suspect the same goes for your similar kinds of conventions.

What I think we ought to be casting around for are ways of discovering the levers which, when pulled, will raise, to everybody's surprise, the largest load. And I think this is a kind of analytical procedure that we in England simply don't engage in at all. I suspect it's one that the Russians engage in to some extent when, in all their educational planning, they quite specifically calculate that for every good teacher there are two bad or two indifferent, and literally in their assessment of which tasks can be done and what resources you need to do them, they make this kind of simple rule-of-thumb calculation.

In England this would be thought singularly ill-mannered of us, and we don't even get that far. But if I can illustrate what I am saying -- and I am only stating a problem out loud -- we have gone, in the last two years or three in England, through a really rather ghastly procedure which has resulted in the creation of an enormous new examing apparatus for the less academic child. As you know, we have our GCEO level and our GCEA level for the more academic, aged 16 and then aged 18. The less academic child, whom we have carefully located in another kind of institution altogether, called the Modern School, was, according to the rubric which got him there, going to be freed from the pressure of the external examination and thus the teaching to which he was going to be subjected would equally be free from external compulsions and could suit itself to his needs and move off with him into uncharted territories.

And the 1944 Butler Act was on the whole full of this kind of idealism on behalf of the less academic child.

What in fact has been the history here? We brought into the Modern School, as I call it, after the war, an unusual kind of teacher, in that he was a person who had gone through the war, in the services, was unqualified, and we put him through the emergency training colleges and trained him in one year.

Now, as we all knew, this was impossible, so we said. In fact, however, by this means we produced some of the best teachers we've had. I don't think there is any doubt of this at all. I enormously regret the closing down of the emergency training colleges rather than their transformation into something comparable.

Now, these people came in and they fitted the rubric of the act. They were people of no great commitment to teaching. They never thought of themselves as teachers until the kind of accident of demobilization made them so. They were lively. They welcomed the opportunity to work in this somewhat experimental social atmosphere of the Modern School and they did well.

Ten years later the orthodoxies had settled in, arteries had hardened, interest had become vested and we found that the Modern School was being staffed by pale reflections of grammar school teachers, and the Modern School was gradually trying to earn its respectability, not by its unorthodoxies but by its increasing orthodoxies. Precisely at this moment, of oourse, the Modern School realized that it was without this marvellous machine for respectability, the leaving examination, since by definition virtually all the children in it were not capable of a good performance in the GCO level at the age of 16.

There were, therefore, clearly two solutions. One was to push as many children in the Modern School as you possibly could into the GCO level, whether it was any good for them or not, and scrape up what looked like a performance -- looked like a performance to parents, that is, who were most worried by the fact that their children appeared not to be getting the appropriate social cache. Secondly, of course, was to concoct a new exam that would be apparently different but in fact would be a pale, watered-down version of the GCE and this would produce a watered-down form of respectability. Thus an enormous procedure was gone through three years age by the thing called the Below Committee, Below himself being a former chief educational officer of Surrey, and laterally the lay chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Below Committee, which had upon it nothing that even remotely looked like a sociologist and took good care not to consult one in the whole course of its investigations, produced its formula for this Below GCE exam, everybody fearing that before long they would have to have a below Below GCE examination.

This was quite literally a kind of GC apparatus which had written into it, of course, very large phrases about teacher control, which was quite the lastthing anyone would now wish who wanted a serious examination.

As a result of a large amount of quite literally political fighting, it was at least transformed, between its first appearance and its final promulgation, into an instrument which permitted -- and I am getting, I think, to the second of my related points -- into an instrument of examination which permitted now three alternative ways of conducting the examination, and this is where I come to this question of the levers.

Because it's all very well to blow off a very great deal of steam about external examinations, though not enough of us in England do so because the external examinations has got the absolute throttle-hold of the system.

What one has to find is almost literally a device which can substituee for the external examination something else which has radically different kinds of dynamic and educational pressures. And I think that we have now got written into the regulations for the Below Examination the CSE, Certificate of Secondary Education, three alternatives opened to the school as to the ways children may be examined.

One is the formal external exam, which you merely write off to whatever it is, Manchester or someone, and indent for 500 copies of an examination, and you set your children to it and send the papers off and they mark them. This is the standard English pattern, as you know.

Or you can alternatively bring together a group of schools who are in the vicinity of each other and they can work out their own common examination papers and submit them to the Board, and these will then be approved, an external examiner appointed to the group, and will examine itself.

Or, thirdly, a school can in fact put forward its own examination papers based on its own syllabuses, and again, with the appointment of an external examiner, these will then be approved as the exam.

Now, I think as a piece of paper work this was an absolute major victory. It established the equal validity, notionally speaking and prestigiously speaking, of three quite radically different kinds of examination techniques. I don't think there is any doubt that those schools which take up the third option or take up, indeed, the second, which involves bringing schools together locally, English teachers together, to discuss how they would examine their rather different syllabuses, (math teachers ditto) would largely transform the way in which the teacher in England viewed his role of teaching and the kinds of criticism that he then subjected himself to from his colleagues. In England he viruually never has any criticism at all, owing to a kind of hallowed principle that the teacher is the lord of his own castle in his classroom and no one comes into it and says anything at all, let alone does he allow the Professor Hooks, as it were, in to offer him reflective thoughts on his incompetence.

Now, of course, the answer is going to be, you might say, that no schools and no teachers are going to pick up alternatives 2 and 3. I mean, this is partly the snag of what has been achieved. This is not quite so. In certain local authorities in England, the chief education officers faced with this problem of implementing this new exam, have in two or three cases at least said that the whole thing has come on them too suddenly to get involved in working out alternative 1, the external exam, and therefore for a year or two schools have just got to fend for themselves under alternatives 2 and 3, and it would be very interesting to see what in fact they do.

Where we have examples ot this kind of group examining or internal examining, it has almost transformed the dynamic of education in that area.

In one such area, which was functioning before all this began, I attended to give a talk to the annual meeting of the examiners involved in running their own little group exam. This might have been 10% of the enrolled teachers in those schools, I suppose, or in some way involved in the exams. They said: we'll have a whole holiday on the day of this meeting, merely to empty the school in order to hold the meeting. All the teachers, 90% of them, they say, may attend this meeting if they like as a kind of gesture and sit in on the exam panels. In fact, 97% of the teachers in those schools attended that day because, after five years of this operation, all the teachers know that their work was enormously influenced by the kinds of exams that they, by proxy through their immediatecolleagues, were creating for themselves.

Now, I call this a leverbut I can suggest just one further lever which, though an administrative device, if one likes, has within it the seeds of revolution, and I take it this is in a sense what we want, In any event, talking about revolutions, what we've got to do is to find the pieces of gelignite which in face create revolutions.

There is not doubt in my mind that English education as a whole would be absolutely radically revolutionized by one extremely minute procedure if we could insist upon it--let me add thats an important parenthesis--and this would be that in every examination, external and internal, books could be taken into the exam. This, in my view, would absolutely revolutionize both the exams themselves, the teaching that went on in relation to the exams, the ways in which the exams were marked, and the assumptions you would draw from the examinations.

I've been concentrating on exams, because with us this is quite clearly the point of the system that is most solidified and conservative and has to be attacked first, and where attack can have the largest effect. I suggest two almost technical devices which could almost transform English education. I have left open the question as to whether you could in England or anywhere else actually legislate that (a) exams shall be internal or group exams and (b) books shall be taken into examination, whatever kind of exam it is.

This you may say begs the question. But it doesn't quite, beg the question of looking for what I call, in one way, the weakest point of the system and the one where the smallest charge, the smallest pushing of a lever will produce the largest explosion. And I think we've literally got to approach our discusssions of this sort of program in education with this kind of very calculated social engineering in mind.

R. Freeman Butts: I am very much impressed by this notion of where do we pick up, where do we find the leverage, and Ted says it's in the teachers of teachers and in the training of superintendents. I think this is probably basically correct.

We have been going through a decade or more, we educationists, of very severe criticism from our academic friends and our publicists, which has made us squirm and feel dirty and incompetent as well as subversive, but I think the corner has changed, I think we have turned the corner.

Jud mentioned the influx of thousands of new students into the colleges and they are soon going into the graduate schools, and what are they going to do? Inevitably some of them are going to have to get into education, just because there is no place else to go, if for no other reason.

Education is still lowest on the academic totem pole, or very low. I don't think we can count on the liberal arts colleges to initiate the flow of the best people into the field of professionaleducation unaided, and probably we can't count on the graduate schools, but in a sense I think maybe we can count on the graduate schools more than we can on the liberal arts colleges.

The hope I find is in the major graduate universities which have not been able to prevent the development of major graduate schools of education but are now beginning to work with them more and more closely. It seems to me this is the leverage for the next decade or so.

Just count--tremendous influx into college, and Jud is dead right--the colleges are going to be the next footballs. They are going to be the ones which will get more and more attention from those who have been having a field-day with the elementary schools and the secondary schools.

And turn it around--the increased study of the importance of education in developing countries is one of the most significant things that's happened in the last decade, too.

s

In a country like ours, where we have been accustomed to education for 200 years or nearly 150 years on a fairly large mass scale, the rest of the world is waking up very quickly to the importance of education and the need for qualified and good teachers. And they are desperate for education, and in that desperation they are beginning even to look in the United States as well as to Britain and other parts of the world for help. We have seen it time and time again with the hundreds and thousands of Peach Corps volunteers, who have wanted to do smething, wanted to join the Peach Corps and, by golly, the only thing they could do was to become teachers in order to join the Peach Corps. And their motivation to do something was even greater then the inherited antipathy for teaching which they've got in their liberal arts colleges. And what is happening is that hundreds of them are finding that teaching is a pretty good outlet for the kind of motivations which led them into the Peach Corps in the beginning. So they are flooding back after Peace Corps service, many of them to continue graduate work and to try out this business of teaching or of graduate work in the fields which will lead then on into some kind of educational work. In many cases they have had their prejudices about education and teacher-training confirmed by the training programs they have had, but in other cases they have found that the training really wasn't so bad as they has been led to believe, after all.

The economists have discovered how important education is in economic development. Now the political scientists are discovering how important education is in political socialization, and the sociologists, and so on--I don't need to go down the list.

But the MIT Center for International Studies, the Harvard Center, the Princeton Center, the Yale Center and all are going to discover that a country that wants to move from a traditional form of society to a modern form has got to press forward on the educational front.

It begins to open our eyes a little bit as to the role of education. Clark Kerr said last spring that in a conference of economists from all over the world in Europe--I am not sure just where it was and I can't quote exactly--but he was reporting their general judgment that as they looked at America in the last 150 years and tried to explain why economic development was so rapid and so important here, they decided it was not our munificint natural resources, it was not our great genius for technology, it was not our free enterprise system so much as it was the spread of free public universal education.

I look forward with a lot more optimism that I did a decade ago to the leverageby which the prestige of education can be raised so that the very best people will be coming into the schools of education as they work in and through the graduate faculties, and we have got three good examples before us today.

Urie Bronfenbrenner: If it be correct that it is when you teach a subject that you learn a subject, or at least that this is one of the vehicles for teaching, it would follow that this would be relevant, not only in the training of teachers, but presumably in teaching; that is, that the experience ot teaching should be utilized not only incolleges but in secondary or perhaps elementary schools.

This idea has some interesting implications, particularly when you have seen it used. It isa feature of the Soviet educational system, and a very ingenious one, and its primary aim is not subject matter teaching, but essentially the teaching of attitudes and orientations with respect to your fellows.

The assumption is that most persons need subject matter primarily in their work because they have to be able to communicate about it, and that in most jobs, professional, technical and otherwise, most of your time is spent in showing somebody else how to to the parts of this job. Therefore, teaching should be a fundamental part of learning any subject matter.

This has a number of other implications in terms of the problems that were cited here. Soviet classrooms, while legally supposedly small, actually are numbering 40 or 50. This is a practicable solution. It has a further impact in terms of the attitudes which are communicated about teaching and the interest and enthusiasm about teaching. Teaching becomes an exciting experience when you have to do it every day, when you begin to get rewards from it, from other kids who say, "Thanks. Now I understand." It leads people to value teaching and to want to become teachers.

It relates to another possibility, this question of how do we train teachers. It seems clear to me that the training of teachers is a university undertaking, not a school of ecucation undertaking even primarily, and that one of the possibilities, one of the devices, the levers one might attempt to experiment with is to get the subject matter departments or persons in the subject matter departments who are interested to introduce the teaching of the suvject matter as a device for the learning of the subject matter, not for the training of teachers but because it assists in the process to which they are primarily committed.

I call attention to this because I think this kind of device simultaneously has the possibility, of meeting problems of subject matter learning, of motivation for the teaching profession and of increasing the status and prestige of teaching activity at all levels of the educational system. And it may represent the kind of device which in our society is possible to introduce with consequences; it becomes a snowball and an exciting thing could help change the picture which now confronts us.

Martin Mayer: There are two very closely related points I wanted to make.

One of them is that we have has an establishment of revolutionaries which has the usual problem of the terror and which has the difficulty that every establishment of revolutionaries has just conducted the last revolution and is damned it anybody else is going to conduct any revolution. I think it is an unfortunate thing and I think that the word "revolution," though a very attractive one in certain styles of conversation and life, is a bad word. What we want are gamblers. This is, of course, what is being talked about in the attempt to rescue the modern school from the slough which people who talk "parity of esteem" put it in. In this connection, Mr. Shaplin's point on the volunteers and on the question of bringing people in is in large part a question of how much you are willing to gamble. Our certification requirements, our tight organizations of schools, our superintendency systems, our external examinations, all of these are efforts to avoid the gamble which is inherent in human existence.

What we all are talking about is an effort to see if we can't somehow reverse this, if we can't somehow make use of people whose qualifications have not been officially certified by an organization established and warranted to certify people, if we can't develop programs which will not necessarily lead to where everybody thinks programs ought to go, everybody being the everybody who's been officially licensed to have an opinion on this sort of matter. If we try to look at it in this way, in terms of taking risks, of broadening the effort with the full expectation that we are going to have a lot of failures--we are going to have a lot of failures, anyway--we may be a good distance ahead of the game.

I'd like to take one second on the argument between Dean Sizer and Prof. Hook. I once had occasion to play with this problem of trying to figure out what something you know very well looks like to somebody who never ran into it before. This is a profound intellectual effort. It is by no means a hundred per cent a question of what is in the child. It is to a very large extent a question of what is in what you are teaching. And I believe that this is what Dean Sizer was saying, and I think that any step backward from that is a step very far back in terms of our understanding of what we are doing.

The Chairman: I'll take a total of three or four minutes--to comment on some of the points which I think would have made me happier had they received some expansion.

In discussing the reward system, I think we need to remember that what constitutes a reward for anybody depends on his expectations, and the expectations of men and women teachers are markedly different, not only markedly different but almost the obverse of each other.

In this regard, The NEA and the AFT, although they fight about everything, agree that everybody needs more money and that men and women teachers should be treated with complete equality, and that they are to be differentiated in no way at all, and that in fact only a few minor physical differences differentiate them at all in the classroom.

This, of course, I think is hardly the truth, but this is the situation under which we operate in the schools.

Also in terms of a merit system to which Dean Schaefer referred very pointedly and very well, we have the anomale that in the school system everybody opposes it. Here, again, the NEA and the AFT combine their strength to tell us that the merit systems are bad. Moreover, the brightest teachers in our school systems are the ones who are most articulate in their attacks on any system of merit. And the only people apparently, who are willing to give any consideration to merit systems at all as a part of the reward system are the administration and a number of fairly undistinguished teachers. This as anamalous, it's paradoxical.

Regardingthe matter of subject matter mastery, to which Prof. Hook referred, I think some very subtle but really significant differences obtain in relation to the subject which is being taught. Certainly any teacher in the secondary school who is teaching secondary school English whould have a grasp of subject matter which enables him to understand the grandeur of Shakespeare of Milton. In other words, he must to able to reach out to the ends of the discipline to know what it is he is talking about. And similarly in social studies, we have to have people teaching about social studies who are really aware of what social studies is all about.

On the other hand, if we were to insist that those people who teach either science or mathematics in our secondary schools are people who are at the forefront of either science or mathematics, we'd be left with nobody at all. And here, again, I think Prof. Hook's point is accurate that here, paradoxically, we very frequently find that the people who ane uncommunicative in the classroom, and in their intense interest in quantified data rather than descriptive material, kill off interest in ordinary elementary and secondary classrooms.

What we are suggesting here is that very different types of training may be required for teachers of different subjects.

Another matter is the requirements for teachers. It's trite and it's commonplace, but what you need is somebody who loves children, and this is apparent to anybody who is in the school system from day to day. Teaching has been likened to art. You have to have an ear for music, I suppose you have to have an eye for form, and the equivalent of this in teaching is a love and patience for children, which not all teachers have. The teachers who come to us, whether they come from the colleges of education or the liberal arts schools, are very frequently not only not lovers of children but are, in a surprisingly large number of cases, inimical to children. They are dangerous to children, and we would be well off if we could take these people, since they operate on tenure, if we could give them their salaries for the rest of their lives and tell them to stay home. Everybody would be better off. These people are already in our schools, and in considerable number.

The rule-of-thumb of one good teacher for two incompetents is--I won't say that's a geneous appraisal or not, but it's not too far from what the facts are.

Here too, we are dealing with scholars, and the scholars need to be reminded that most of the education of teachers and administrators takes place on the job. I have never, without exception, seen a brand-new school teacher coming into a school system, regardless of the greatness of the institution he has come from, who was really prepared to do a job. We all learn our job on the job and staff development is really one of the great responsibilities of the school administrator. We learn so much.

We don't know what it is you are to teach them in your own schools, because we don't know what problems they face. I can only suggest that there is an attitude that should be taught, an attitude which should be conveyed. One of these attitudes is perhaps a matter of selection rather than teaching. Maybe the thing to do is to select for teaching those people who, for reasons going back far into their youth, are inclined to be adventuresome rather than fearful. Secondly, somehow or other by exhortation or example, in the colleges we must teach people to be less fearful and give them some commitment to the innovative principle in education, because the vast majority of teachers who come into our schools are committed not to the innovative principle but to conservatism. Especially the youngsters, and the younger they are and the more recently they have come to us from your colleges, the more conservative and reactionary they are and the less innovative they are.

Practically, if you look into the school systems you will find that any support we have for innovative practice, which invariably, as Ted says, starts at the administrative level, receives its support not from the youngsters but from the middle-aged teachers. Note here the resistance of teachers, not only resistance but absolute hostility, to anything that's been tried, whether it's team teaching or educational TV or program instruction, no matter what we have tried. I am not arguing for the special merits of these innovations. But I am saying that teachers have fought back with such resistance and hostility, that no labor-saving device in the railroad industry or elsewhere has been fought more strongly by labor there. It's just an appalling thing to observe.

Perhaps the colleges should have some part in altering the emotions and attitudes or prospective teachers, as well as the substantive material they have in their minds.

This business of revolutionaries. Ted says that the establishment itself has to revolutionize itself. This is a counsel of perfection that cannot possibly take place. It seems to me that the definition of an establishment is that is becomes a self-perpetuating oligarchy. It cannot be reformed from inside. I think the reformation has to come from outside. And the revolutions tend to succeed each other, and with periods of intermediate terror in between. I quite agree.

Finally, there is something strange about the profession of education. First of all--this is without exception the most nervously and physically exhausting of all jobs. I make no exceptions. I don't carewhether you are talking about brain surgery or anything else. There is no job which is as nervously and physically exhausting as teaching school every day.

If a teacher gets home at night and is not dog-tired, it's because he hasn't done his job.

Moreover, another element I always find, or almost always--that's perhaps too strong a term, but it's so frequent is lack of satisfaction with one's performance. Even an ordinary physician feels he's done ordinarily well. Even lawyers who lose cases feel that they are practicing law very well. But what is there in the teaching profession that makes teachers so unhappy about their performance? I am not speaking here of the divine discontent of people who know they have done well but are driven by something inside to do even better. These people down deep feel that they are doing miserably, and a typical teacher, when she goes to bed at night and draws up the covers, even if she's been teaching for 20 years, thanks God she hasn't been found out up to new. This is the crux.

What is it we are doing; what is it that starts in the liberal arts college and the teacher-training college, what is it we are doing in supervision and administration that fails to give this reward to teachers who are working themselves to death and somehow, or other never have a sense of satisfaction and fulfillment.

SESSION SEVEN

Theme: BEYOND THE TWELFTH YEAR: THE PROBLEM OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

Introduction	JOHN WHITE	i
Theme Paper and Supplementary Comments	JOHN W. POWELL	27 - 27 c
Discussion	LOUIS HACKER	28 - 34
Discussion	ERNEST VAN DEN HAAG	35 - 40
Response	JOHN W. POWELL	41 - 43
Additional Queries and Comments		44 - 48

INTRODUCTION

by

John White

This is the concluding session of these meetings. This is the session in which in candor we must confess you have stayed because you are ladies and gentlemen. This is also the session which deals with continuing education which always comes last on every educator's list. It is the section of education about which institutions print pious words in their catalogues. But these are really a cover-up for the fact that this is the one division of an institution which contributes financially and makes money. It is a much-maligned area. It is an area in which there's been far too much talk and far too little effective action.

The paper and the discussions are by people who believe in that old proverb which says that if you are going to make an omelet, you have to break eggs. I hope we do break some eggs here today, and I think we will.

John Powell, in his 30-year career has stimulated and educated and challenged young people and not so young people over that entire period. He is a teacher, a philosopher and just about the official historian for educational television in this country.

John has a war that he wants to start, a war on poverty, but his is a war on poverty of the spirit, you will recall. He points up the fact that if continuing education is to be taken seriously, there are five things he believes you must do.

1. Disregard any standardized notion of the "educated man."
2. Abandon the stereotype of the Protestant-Capitalist ethos as a test for whether or not a man is "educated" or "educable".
3. Adapt the most advanced technology that we have -- programmed books, inexpensive but professionally selected teaching machines, radio and television, and, if necessary, bread and circuses, in order to gather people together under the tent of educational salvation. Those are pious words, too.
4. We have to fight not poverty of goods alone, but poverty of spirit.
5. Money is the passive necessity in trying to meet this problem. But an active combination of passion and ingenuity is going to be required to instill into the American people what Bertrand Russell called a life "inspired by love and guided by knowledge".

Conference on QUALITY AND EQUALITY IN EDUCATION
Princeton University
December 2 to 4, 1965

CONTINUING EDUCATION AND THE GENERAL WILL

John Walker Powell
University of Miami

> "The great problem of all civilizations is the creation of citizens: that is, of people who are dominated by the idea of the general welfare."
>
> AE, The National Being

The role and meaning of education in our society have undergone a remorseless change within our own generation. I am speaking of education in its most inclusive sense, whether it be the acquiring of skills, of knowledge, or of understanding.

In the eighteenth century, education was desirable for gentlemen, and was sought by common men who wanted to rise in station, perhaps to enter public life and serve their country.

In the nineteenth century, education was fashionable for the scions of the rich; it was sought by those who wanted better jobs, or by immigrants wanting an American identity; and it was freely forced upon thousands of children who wished it had never been invented.

Today, education -- whatever you choose to understand by that word -- has become a prime instrument of the national purpose, a primary goal of national policy. In the language of Rousseau, education is one of the imperatives of the General Will. But Jean-Jacques also added that "the General Will is not the same as the will of all"; and our compulsory schooling merely illustrates his doctrine that he who resists the General Will must be "forced to be free." We share with the ancient Athenians the philosophy that education is the high road to freedom. The definition of freedom, however, has changed somewhat: In the second half of the twentieth century, freedom means to Americans some combination of leisure, affluence, security from war, and the pursuit of happiness.

For our adult population, however, there have been no compulsions except those of hunger, ambition, curiosity, or the need for social contact and the filling of leisure time. If my initial proposition is correct, what we are faced with is a new kind of imperative: a perception of life-long education as a patriot's duty, which may reach the force of a popular will that men and women should continue to advance their education, by whatever means, or be looked upon as slackers. The mood of policy is that "ignorance is un-American" -- a proposition amply demonstrated by the House Committee of that name. Indeed, it is often held that the nation's survival depends upon the excellence of our universities - though whether that excellence is defined in terms of the Establishment's job, of competing, or their own, of questioning what we are competing for, is not specified.

Will the Real "Educated Man" Please Stand Up?

Should we try to define this goal? What shall we call "an educated man?"

William James remarked that "an educated man knows a good man when he sees one" -- a proposition that, applied to many of our political contests, recent or past, would cast grave doubt upon the state of education in this country. John Dewey suggested that "an educated man is one who is capable of further education" -- a proposition that would cast further doubt on the effectiveness of our high schools and colleges. Abraham Flexner offered the tempting goal of developing "intelligence capable of being applied in any field whatever" -- an injunction that might be laid equally upon education in science or domestic science, nursing or engineering, the social sciences or the humanities. Our dedication to specialization militates against this hope. But Mary Follett must have had us in mind when she wrote, in 1934, "It is not a knowledge of his specialty which makes an expert of service to society, but his insight into the relation of his specialty to the whole." 1

I once defined an educated man as one who knows enough of the past to place himself in the present, and enough of the present not to be surprised by the future. And, perhaps I should add, enough about how others live to make life interesting where he is. For life is more interesting to the educated man; and so, as the Times slogan has it, is he.

Education Beyond High School

My concern here is with educational opportunities beyond the high school: admittedly, an enormous realm, ranging from trade schools to colleges to university graduate and professional programs, and to continuing education on any level; and on again to the opportunities offered by educational television and radio, by libraries and museums, by galleries and concert halls and theaters, by civic, social, and service organizations; by lecture series and labor union programs; and finally by the kind of observation and contemplation that, for the interested man, transforms sheer experience into what we could call an education.

The question I have been asked is to what extent, and in what ways, factors within the society tend to facilitate or to impede the achievement of equal and quality education for all, "regardless of talent." In search of some answers, I shall cite the opinions of a few distinguished leaders as to what the quality of the liberally educated American mind should be. I shall quote from two business leaders, political and military leaders, and a leader in education. The first is Mr. Albert Nickerson of the Socony-Vacuum Oil Corporation. He cites with approval the statement that "we need people with convictions reasonably and deeply held, the sane judgments which come from emotional stability, and the imaginative comprehension which comes from understanding the whole condition of man." Then he adds his own word: "Our business system, indeed our whole scheme of contemporary American life, requires the education of men and women of moral stamina who can think and who can discriminate among values. This implies the necessity for the continued extension of a sound liberal education." Still quoting from business leaders, I turn to Gilbert Chapman, president of Yale and Towne: "There is a growing fear in the United States that we are facing as great a danger from internal ignorance as from external attack. Our advancing technology has fostered the rapid growth of specialization, and with it the intellectually incomplete man . . . . The United States has become a dominant power in the world, but she cannot for long exercise her power or fulfill her mission without our being a people literate, educated, and cultivated . . . . The specialist must also be a humanist."

Even the leadership of our military education has turned with emphasis in this same direction. The service academies have, since the last war, given new importance to the humanities and the social sciences, on the view that "present concepts of warfare make it necessary to produce men . . . with a clear picture of the political, social, and economic factors that underlie the problems of our time . . . We are training generals, not second lieutenants."

Dwight Eisenhower, speaking as President of the United States at Pennsylvania State University in June, 1955, added this statement: "We are not as proficient as we should be in providing a broad citizenship education to those who specialize in the many technical fields. And . . . even in liberal education, we have permitted it to become too much a specialization, rather than a broad, liberating influence . . . What we need is general education, combining the liberal and the practical, which helps . . . . achieve the solid foundation of understanding - understanding of man's social institutions, of man's art and culture, and of the physical and biological and spiritual world in which he lives. It is an education which helps each individual learn how to relate one relevant fact to another; to get the total of relevant facts affecting a given situation in perspective; and to reason critically and with objectivity and moral conscience toward solutions."

And finally, from Alexander Meiklejohn, our country's foremost artist and architect of education, this statement: "Our scheme of government and of life can succeed only if, in their more mature years, men and women will engage in careful, enthusiastic, and guided study of common values, common dangers, and common opportunities."

The Three Levels of Learning

The statements I have cited from leaders of business, government, the military, and education, have uniformly stressed the necessity for what I shall simply call "intelligence" - that is, social intelligence about the goals of a democratic society within a world dedicated to peace. Intelligence, however, is helpless without knowledge; and knowledge is inapplicable without skill. The three levels of learning which our people must, if they are to seek the national imperative, be motivated to pursue are, in ascending order, the learning of skills, the acquisition of knowledge, and the pursuit of understanding.

Ideally, all three levels could be combined in a single program of education. It has been our more characteristic practice to separate them into different spheres. The first we pursue, for example, through what we call "manpower retraining" and vocational schools; the second, through college and postgraduate courses, home study, and industrial training in the fields in which knowledge is requisite; the last, through study and discussion, through our civic and social organizations, and through the informal and non-credit programs which appeal to the social curiosity of intelligent men and women.

In each of these realms of education for maturity, enormous resources have made available seemingly limitless opportunities for the pursuit of learning. I grant that this statement sounds exaggerated; what makes it valid is that the population motivated to seek learning by the use of these resources is so small in proportion to the available resources that the opportunities appear to be limitless. I shall try to suggest what some of these resources are, and to estimate what I shall call"the motivational deficit" between what is available and what is utilized.

Manpower Retraining

Even in cities and areas with the highest unemployment, there are thousands of jobs still open and vacant which require skill and education. In 1962, Congress passed the Area Redevelopment Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act. Under the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act, the government was authorized to spend $435 million over three years in the education and retraining of the unemployed.

In my own city of Miami, in 1964, 3,500 high school students failed to continue on to college. Currently, less than 350 of these - less than one in ten - are enrolled in manpower retraining. Within the Greater Miami area, with a population of over a million, 3,500 to 5,000 students drop out from high schools every year - youths between sixteen and twenty-one years of age. In the fourth year of the Dade County program, 325 are in retraining.

The total of adults in retraining is currently 200. Some 40,000 individuals are enrolled in continuing education, including conferences and workshops, at the University, the Junior College, and the Dade County high schools; approximately three-quarters of them for college credit. We have our share of unemployment; but the number of jobs offered in the help-wanted pages of the two papers runs to about two pages a day - and runs, and runs, and runs. Many of these are trainee positions with pay. What we lack is a detailed analysis of the kinds of people who are unemployed, as against the kinds of jobs that stay open. Here I think we might find some clues to this deficit of motivation.

In 1962, also, I was consultant to the Educational Projects Division of IBM, which, with the help of the Advertising Council and the blessing of the Labor Department, was preparing to launch a nationwide drive to create motivation in the idle to seek training for jobs, and in those with jobs to seek training for better ones. The aim was going to be precisely to identify training with patriotism and the public interest. Then came the War on Poverty legislation, which duplicated or overlapped many of the features of the manpower retraining program; and the plan for the proposed drive faltered. As The New Yorker remarked, "The money this year is in poverty."

The Elements of a "Motivational Drive"

What would it take to create the incentive for enough men and women to advance their skills to meet the need for manpower?

As agreed upon by the Labor Department, the IBM and Advertising Council planners, and their consultants from adult education, the essentials would have to include:

(a) A sustained program of motivational advertising, in press, periodicals, radio, and both commercial and educational television.

(b) Intensive local organization of business and industrial leaders, firms, and plants, with educational agencies and civic and social leaders, and additional efforts by local media.

(c) Rapid but accurate surveys of projected manpower needs, by skill and by number, together with parallel surveys of projected job-loss through automation and other obsolescence.

(d) All-out pilot programs in selected cities representing different types of production and organization, with 100% cooperation by leaders, agencies, and firms; pilot training classes in local plants, offices, laboratories, and educational facilities.

(e) Concrete and measurable rewards, individual and community prizes, and job guarantees for those who complete training.

There were more; I am citing only a few to suggest the magnitude of the motivational task. Interestingly, it was assumed by the planners that the basic support would have to rest in patriotism: with White House support, re-training would be wrapped in the flag of national survival and growth, as well as linked to the appeal of personal growth and prosperity.

Now, why was it assumed that such a huge battle plan would be required? What were the obstacles to be overcome? Remember, we are still on the level of bread and butter, where "the economic man" of Adam Smith should be assumed to have been looking after his own interests. And I am staying on this level to see whether we can develop a model that will be applicable to education on other levels as well.

The Roots of Apathy

Our obvious concern is, as I have said, to produce a continuous stream of workers who can keep up with the demands of an advancing technology -- even while those already trained are being laid off by the geometric progression of automation. This concern is thoroughly shared by industry and business themselves. Ever larger numbers of companies are offering wage incentives and paying course fees to tempt workers into study of advanced technology - even while those already trained are being replaced by self-correcting transistorized machines. This concern is thoroughly shared by industry and business themselves. Ever larger numbers of companies are offering wage incentives and paying course fees to tempt workers into study of advanced technologies in their fields. Yet, the National Industrial Conference Board in 1956 reported that less than 5% of eligible workers were taking advantage of tuition aid. Does this represent inertia, fatigue, or resistance?

Let us look a little more closely at this notion of resistance. How many kinds are there? One which I consider basic is "resistance to going back to school" - the rejection of the image which school itself has implanted in the minds of millions. I have known this to be true even of a school principal, who was embarrassed to be seen going into the public library because he was afraid that in so doing he would show his ignorance. It may be that it is our schools themselves that leave so many Americans resistant to the renewal of the educational pursuit.

Further, and deeper, there is resistance on the part of those _not_ of the middle class being forced to adhere to the _ethos_ of that class. This has been found again and again in studies of drop-outs, and of the relocation of urban slum dwellers, such as in Boston's West End; and even in a remarkable study of the dreadful slums of Puerto Rico and the resistance of the slum dwellers to being moved into public housing, in which they missed the noisy, noisome propinquity of their inert, quarrelsome, smelly, but warm neighbors. As seen from the bottom of society, to move upward is to conform, to become a prisoner of authority.

There is, of course, also the vast ethnic despair of the minority groups, such as the Negro, who know that with any amount of schooling they can still be excluded from the society that beckons them in. There is the prescient economic despair of the slum white boy who knows that when he has finished his training, the jobs will have disappeared. In short, a large part of the unleavened lump refuses to rise because it knows that it will rise only to be eaten. Whether this attitude is being underwritten by local, state, and national programs of welfare and relief is a matter of divided opinion.

And then, though it might not seem conceivable to you and me in our somewhat higher and hence more ambitious level of existence, there is such a thing as being satisfied with one's lot: the familiar bickering with one's wife, the warm and noisy saloon at the corner, the cronies at the pool hall, and fellow-workers who are of one's own kind and are therefore comfortable to work with. To leave this life, in order to enter the world of power struggle and competition, is simply beyond the energy level of thousands. It has never really occurred to us to adapt our educational approach to this state of mind. A few settlement houses have succeeded, and we have consistently underestimated the educational role of the bartender; but the first aims at upward mobility, the second at complacency with one's lot. Tomorrow's technicians are unlikely to be drawn from this stratum.

There is also a parochialism of self-defeat, which never looks higher than the local ward boss and the unemployment check. This is, even though peacefully and sometimes contentedly, the _lumpen_ _proletariat_. It is to be distinguished from two other classes: the pathological, and the individuals who prefer not to become part of a world of which they do not approve. The latter are the domestic expatriates; I have a friend who has defined one task of adult education as that of the Americanization of the native-born.

If the nation is really dedicated to the goals of skill, knowledge, and understanding, these psychological, emotional, ethnic, and economic resistances must be not only recognized, but "researched" by a multitude of skilled teams from universities, foundations, and governments. The results of existing research need to be collated and studied by task forces of what I would call "social philosophy and implementation."

Now, I shall turn to the other side of this coin, which equally needs research study: the success-story participants in education, at all adult levels: what one loosely calls "the elite". What is their make-up and motivation?

The Self-Chosen People

These are a species that has been fairly well defined, in statistical and socio-economic terms, and also in terms of a kind of cultural energy quantum, in reading-discussion groups and in educational television.

It does take energy to go home from work, eat dinner, detach your wife from kitchen and nursery, and troop off to some other place for a two-hour discussion of Plato, Communist foreign policy, or modern painting. Yet scores of thousands are doing it. It takes less energy to switch the television set to a channel which is showing Casals, O'Doherty, Crane Brinton, or a Canadian study of life in Australia. Even then, some people resent being asked to "go back to school" to a TV set. But there is a substantial audience that enjoys it, just as there is for study-discussion groups sponsored by libraries, evening colleges, or just by themselves. And it is this audience that I want to describe.

My data are drawn from several sources independent of each other. All that they have in common is that the programs whose populations have been studied are all concerned with intellectual stimulation and cultural entertainment. These are the top-level programs in terms of educational and cultural quality. Taking all the studies together, they cover various samples totaling some 50,000 individuals in some 165 communities - a very tiny fraction of the fifteen to twenty million who, regularly or intermittently, watch the nation's ninety-four educational television stations or take part in regular study-discussion and other cultural-intellectual or social interest courses.

The striking thing is the uniformity of the profiles of all these samples. It does not rely entirely upon socio-economic similarity; but it reflects a consistent profile of personal interest and activity. Here, for example, are excerpts from a summary of four studies of the population in regular liberal adult study-discussion groups around the country, about 1960:

"Perhaps most amazing, and certainly fraught with some challenging implications and questions, is the consistency of the profile of those who enroll. Take educational attainment: college graduates and those with advanced degrees form from fifty to sixty percent, and only sixteen percent have had no schooling beyond the secondary. (Davis gives the neatly reversed figure for all adult Americans in 1950: 84 percent had not gone beyond high school. More than a third of Davis' 2,000 respondents had done graduate study, but only six percent of the general adult population.)

"Take occupations: professional and managerial account for well over half of all discussion-group members, and for over eighty percent of the men. Ratios of women (usually sixty percent), of married people, of age groups (the preponderance falling between 35 and 45), of income levels (generally above the middle range) - all these, too, show a very high consistency from study to study. Indeed, many other tabulations of liberal arts group members, from other decades and other cities, as well as from the Test Centers of the Fund for Adult Education, show the same high consistency. In Davis' words, these people are 'highly educated, quite married, somewhat female, disproportionately professional.' They tend also to be rather more Democratic than Republican, Protestant than CAtholic; and they show a remarkably high proportion of active memberships in organizations devoted to community or national and international affairs. They are not 'power figures'; but they do, in the majority, represent a kind of 'elite of talent, technical skill, and intellectual training'.

"The minorities in this tabulation are important too, both for educational and for social theory. There are, in nearly all the groups, people without college degrees, professional jobs, or comfortable incomes. There are younger adults, with their way still to make; there are older ones, often of a dissident and critical cast of mind; and there are what pet-food canners call 'inert ingredients'." 2

The most massive parallel comes from the studies by Schramm, Lyle, and Pool of the ETV audience. 3 In 1962, when only 63 ETV stations were on the air* (and some of these UHF, when few UHF receiving sets were on the market), their conservative estimate is that these stations could reach 14 million homes; that among them were up to 7 million regular and perhaps 13 million occasional ETV watchers. Subtracting the in-school and child audience, perhaps 5 to 10 million adults then watched one or more ETV program a week. Among all TV watchers, this is decidedly a minority; but it is "a minority of choice" rather than by external socio-economic determination. With all its ranges of individual difference in age, status, education, income, and so on, "there is a series of characteristics that occur as trends rather than as absolutes. That is, a viewer of educational television is *more likely than* a non-viewer to have certain characteristics . . . . The traits have a great deal of power to predict . . . who *will* and who *will not*, given an equal opportunity, become a viewer of ETV."

---

* The number will have doubled by 1967.

In summary, "*The viewers of ETV are more likely than non-viewers to be well educated and of high socio-economic status*." The odds are 1:3 that a professional will watch; 1:17 that an idle unemployed person will. "It is socio-economic status *and the personality that goes with it* that most clearly separates the public of ETV from its neighbors. . . . A person with postgraduate education and an income of $7,000 to $10,000 a year is more likely to be a viewer than not. A person with only a grade school education and less than $5,000 in income has only one in eleven chances of becoming a viewer." Still, one-fifth of the Boston viewers are of blue-collar status; but "they are recruited from a large base . . . while the professional families, who form but 16 percent of the population, provide one-fourth of the WGBH audience."

"*The viewers of ETV are more likely than non-viewers to be 'achievers'*. They fall into the value system that is currently described in terms of 'deferred gratification norms', 'delayed reward values', work orientation, future orientation, need achievement, and aspiration levels. They tend to be upwardly mobile. They value learning (it leads to self-improvement). They work hard in the present to achieve future goals.

"Achievers are more numerous in the middle class than in the lower class. They are more numerous in some cultures than in others and in some religious denominations than in others. They correspond closely in our society with the people who read books and other serious print. They are scarce among people who have a high intake of entertainment by television or film. And they apparently include a very large proportion of the viewers of ETV." [4]

The ETV audience in the larger cities scores two or more to one in playing an instrument, collecting classical records, listening to FM radio music, reading serious fiction and non-fiction, participating in discussion, and liking chess and the more exacting crossword puzzles. They scored even higher ratios when they and non-viewers were asked to identify important public figures; only one in ten non-viewers knew who Ralph Bunch or J. Robert Oppenheimer or Robert Frost were.

ETV viewers tend to be active in cultural and community events - theatre, concerts, lectures, and social organizations. They enjoy watching sports as much as non-viewers do; they play more sports themselves, and have more hobbies. They watch TV only slightly less than the average; but they turn to the set for *specific programs* they want, rather than becoming glued to it.

In the blue-collar listening audience, certain traits seem also to appear with consistency. Questioned in various cities by the survey teams, the labor-class ETV watchers tended to be ambitious for upward movement; to regard themselves as middle-class; and, in contrast to those objectively in the same status, they were far more likely to display "cultural and civic interest and energy" by their choice of activities. And while 58 percent of labor-class non-viewers showed "low print, high TV" activity, 47 percent of viewers were "high print - high TV" and 23 percent "high print - low TV".

Curiously, my adult voluntary students in three mental hospitals exhibited precisely the same socio-economic and educational profile! [5]

The people I have been describing are the ones we are *not* worried about. They are Jefferson's and Adams's "natural aristocracy of talent and taste." They are not only *in* our Judaeo-Puritan culture of the Protestant-Capitalist ethos; they are *with* it. Our forefathers valued something they called "character"; our own times place their value on "drive". And these people have it.

The Widening Gap

Last evening, Dr. Kirk raised what may be the most fundamental issue in this conference. He spoke, on page ten of his paper, about his "concern over the widening gap in intelligence which we may be producing in our present society. *On the one hand, we may be producing an intellectual class society by providing enriched homes and schools for one section of our affluent society, and, at the same time, providing impoverished homes and inadequate schools for the disadvantaged group which may amount to twenty or thirty percent of our population.*"

Dr. Flanagan had earlier pointed out that students in Negro schools are lucky to run 1.5 standard deviation below the national means for the twelfth grade students. I should like here to call your attention to an article by Mario Pei in the Saturday Review of Literature for November 14. Actually, he is discussing the third edition of *Webster's International Dictionary*, and the discussion is interesting indeed to those of us who hold that there should be standards of meaning in the

English language. But he is asking a more basic question also, and it is the same question which Dr. Kirk has raised: "Should there be a directing class, qualified as such by reason of intellect, education, and general culture, or should there be unbridled democracy with a nose-counting process to determine what was good and what was bad?"

The question, or perhaps spectre, with which we are being confronted may be presented in three alternative questions:

(a) Does the success of our democracy depend upon the identification of a "natural aristocracy of talent and taste", whom we should learn to identify and to nominate for positions of leadership?

(b) Is the stratification of the American people into the educated wise and the underadvantaged proletariat being actually furthered by our lack of knowledge about educational psychology and so-called "intelligence quotients"? _Vide_ the excerpt from Dr. Wilder Penfield, reprinted in CURRENT magazine, November 1964, from an article called _The Uncommitted Cortex_, in _The Atlantic Monthly_ for July of this year, revealing the actual neuro-psychiatric knowledge which is now accumulating to suggest that _the most significant learning takes place in the first few years of life_ - as Dr. Kirk quotes Dr. Bloom as having suggested on the basis of independent evidence.

(c) Or, have we merely neglected to mobilize our collective ingenuity to fasten the motivation toward learning and intelligence on to the natural motives of the "economic man", as in the case of the search for better and more lucrative jobs and for national prosperity?

I would refer you to the November issue of _Adult Leadership_, Volume 13, Number 5, published by the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A. In that issue, Dr. Robert Belding of the State University of Iowa presents an article on the mass education machinery of the Soviet Union. The job of that educational program is to teach three things: literacy, Communist ideology, and industrial skills. Those three goals have been pursued for nearly fifty years through authoritarian collective programs of mass indoctrination. The devices which Dr. Belding cites include fixed and mobile "kiosks" in cities and on collective farms, massive programs of correspondence education leading to the formation of village learning groups, traveling theater groups presenting small plays in favor of motherhood and the brushing of teeth. Programs which are adopted by the republics which compose the Soviet Union have first been tested and approved by the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences in Moscow.

As a massive device for instilling in a huge population the sense of the national purpose, this has probably not been bettered s since the Byzantine Empire; but does any one of you contemplate a day when the United States Office of Education will become an authoritative Academy of Pedagogical Sciences? As a matter of fact, perhaps the most serious deterrent to the development of a national program of education is the superstitious fear, by local communities, counties, and states, that something precious would be lost if there were a national authority in the field of education; and certainly the Office of Education would be the last to assert such a thesis. The actual domination of the Educational Testing Bureau, here in Princeton, is not resented by schools or colleges across the nation, although it does prescribe a national uniformity; its only virtue is that it is not representative of the elective organs of government. How silly can one get?

In the same issue of Adult Leadership, there is an article by Dr. Brazziel of the Norfolk Division of Virginia State College. Dr. Brazziel is concerned with the inclusion of basic education - literacy and numbers skills - as a vital link in the manpower re-training program. At Norfolk, a group of 100 men, re-training for industrial skills in five fields, were also and concurrently given training in reading, writing, and 'rithmetic. These were decidedly underadvantaged men; but they found that if they were to be promoted in the industrial skills which they were learning they had also to increase their basic educational skills; and the adventure was apparently highly successful. In other words, the two motivations were linked: the condition of jobs was an investment in basic educational skills. This is closely related to the Soviet technique; and I hope that it will not be taken lightly merely on that account. Yet remember that in its first two years, the MDP enlisted only 5,000 students out of all our unemployed and underemployed. The fear of a disemployed machinist that he may be in training only to be an unemployed accountant has something to do with this. But the basic fact is that we simply have not known how to stir and latch on to the motivation to learning itself.

Under the streets of San Francisco there run endless steel cables which are rolled over drums in the power houses of the cable railways. On the streets of San Francisco there are cable cars. Their method of locomotion is to apply a "grip" to the moving cable, which pulls them along to their next stop. The cable carries them uphill; it retards their velocity downhill. Hundreds of thousands of people, except in times of power failure, or of one wonderful General Strike in 1934, have ridden to work, shopping, and home again, on vehicles attached to an underground motivation. This, it seems to me, is our task with the adult population of the United States. We must find the underground cables, or furnish them; we must provide "grips" to latch on to these cables; and, within our educational ranks, we must train and provide what in San Francisco are called "gripmen", as well as the conductors who warn the outdoor passengers by shouting "curve!" whenever any radical revision of the route is about to be encountered.

Class Differences in Education

I should like to commend your earnest attention to the re-reading of my friend Edgar Friedenberg's paper which you read for this afternoon's discussion. Edgar's concern goes back to the question over ethnic and class conflict of values. I direct your attention first to his page fourteen. It sounds there as though he is talking about the Congo; but he is actually talking about Mississippi and Alabama and certain counties in Virginia. "A nation is . . . an artificially created social group; and its boundaries need not denote an area of common culture. When they do not, and when the nation is still in a sufficiently tentative stage of development that its citizens are in touch with their actual origins and feel like members of the actual communities, there is likely to be trouble. When a helpless minority retains such a community but has nothing left with which to sustain it or maintain its boundaries, there is trouble for them, and also for the functionaries of the dominant culture whose particular job it is to whip them into the nation." On page fifteen, he is speaking of the school in its function of teaching youngsters how to function in a group, how to compromise and get along with others, giving and accepting leadership and so on without regard for origins or background. This is, he said, "a limiting condition for the school" whether or not it is a "desirable condition of human nature." I further direct yor attention to his characteristically precise language on page fifteen: "What is lost is resonance, fidelity." I am ready to forgive his quip on the Homeric role on page sixteen: but I want to direct your attention to the second line on page seventeen: "Taste depends on the application of some unitary standard derived from the authority of shared experience." Then, glance at the last paragraph on that page: "Unfortunately for those aims of education that are essentially egalitarian, there are fairly consistent social class differences in cognitive style . . . Some of the most interesting research on the academic difficulties of the 'culturally deprived' is directed toward identifying just what these differences are; and some of the most fruitful efforts at improving their academic chances in a middle class school are directed toward providing, belatedly, some of the experiences that make the difference."

The problem we are dealing with here is that of the social chances of those that need to be, as the army used to say, re-treaded in the middle class direction. And Edgar goes on, on page eighteen, to point out that "Even among students of uniformly high academic ability, youth of *high status* tend to have a different *intellectual style* from those who have, instead *high status aspirations*." On page nineteen, he says that "private schools have been making increasingly strenuous efforts to democratize their admissions policies and redefine their concepts of excellence to include more of the virtues of a meritocracy of heterogeneous origin."

It seems to me that this precisely defines the problem which confronts those who are concerned with "continuing" education for Americans beyond high school or above the age of eighteen. You are all aware of the second-class status of our teachers in evening schools and universities; they are likely to be regarded as "the benighted teaching the belated." Within the group discussion programs I mentioned earlier, the leaders are generally "volunteers"; and those who *volunteer* to be leaders are, in a standard proportion of cases, unfit to be. Leadership is an acquired skill, not an exercise in personal exhibitionism, and it requires the most careful selection by experienced and competent professionals.

The last time I was at Princeton for a conference was with the leaders of liberal adult discussion group programs: Great Books, the American Foundation for Continuing Education, the Study-Discussion Program of the Fund for Adult Education, and certain other liberal-arts-for-adults programs.

Benjamin Bloom tried to teach us how to define our objectives. At the end of three or four very intense days, some of us began to make some progress. What we were being asked was to define them in *behaviorly measurable* terms. At first, of course, there was objection from the group that the definition of behavioral objectives might pervert the standards and objectives of teaching, as the Regent's Examinations or the College Boards pervert the teaching in high schools. I was amused by Edgar Friedenberg's observation that this is what he had been taught by progressive educators twenty-five years ago. We are still trying to teach this lesson to our faculties in humanities and social science and natural science at the University of Miami[6]; and yet some of us are still suspicious of what the results would be if we succeeded. The necessary question, then, is, What shall be the definition of *objectives* for the education of the American population over eighteen years of age? Is it whom they vote for? What jobs they perform? What their attitudes are on the Congo and on South Vietnam? How they stand on Michelangelo and Picasso? *Does this nation have any objectives* which are either measurable or definable in behaviorable terms, for the responsible members of its adult population?

Available to our adults are high school, college, or vocational courses taken in the evening; professional and post-doctoral updating courses; and a vast continent of cultural, avocational, current-events, organizational leader-training, book-review, and serious discussion programs. The doctrinal training of Sunday school teachers is included, along with courses in the economics of Henry George: evening lectures on Christian Science, and evening schools of mortuary science. The enormous activities of the Agricultural Extension Service and of the Armed Forces educational programs are included, as are employee training, management training, and general interest courses along with advancement and post-doctoral courses supported by such giants as IBM and GE.

"Equality" in this gigantic smorgasbord, is represented by an almost total freedom of often meaningless choice. But, despite the efforts of such missionary bodies as the Adult Education Association, the Association of University Evening Colleges, and the National University Extension Association, *quality control* is about equal to health control in Civil War medicine. It is difficult to build a coherent program of adult learning, a national service for adult intelligence, by adding together secondary functions branching off from primarily non-adult or non-teaching agencies: the day college, the Armed Services, the Agricultural Vocational Programs, the church, the Rotary club, the Girl Scouts, or business and industry.

The One-Eyed Vision of Man

To the American educational theorist at the adult level, the individual is a kind of Dagwood sandwich: a worker, a parent, a voter, a church-goer, a union member, a civic actor, a consumer, a watcher of television; rarely, a user of the library, and so on. Thus, every institutional program of education has approached him in some *one* function. Progressive education has long talked about the "whole" child; there are few institutional occasions in the learning experience of the American adult which treat him as a whole man, which treat of the relationship between his functions and his roles, which cultivate his thinking power as a multiplex citizen of a great nation. Think back for a moment to the Russian program of mass education for industrial skill, literacy, and Communist ideology. In a free and open society, men have, perform, and are respected in many roles. But by that very token, we have been betrayed into educating people for single roles, not for their common humanity.

There is, in fact, no national school, no national market, for maturity. Motivational psychology has learned the skills of selling toothpaste; but not of selling manhood. In the nation which invented and - you should pardon the expression - perfected the radio and television commercial, we should be able to mobilize the same skills to reduce not dental, but *mental* cavities by 35 percent.

What I have been calling "education" is, in reality, the pursuit of wholeness; but the dissected man, besieged by a segmented society in conflict among its segments, has little incentive to seek it. Since the Kennedys, our national leadership has shown little taste for education - except for other people. Educational television does not serve the end of wholeness, since its regular viewers turn on only the programs about things they are already interested in. Our national task is to devise ways of making people interested in things they are not yet interested in; and this is, by definition, almost a self-contradictory assignment.

I return, therefore, to my question - Must we learn to accept the concept of a permanent elite? As automation proceeds, perhaps as small a percentage of the nation can run its industrial plants as it now runs its agricultural plant. Should we then give up on theothers, as we have on the aged?

I am not yet prepared to believe this. I think we have involved ourselves in an educational trap: those who already possess the ethos of the middle-class, who have taken over both the schools and the social agencies, are impatient of and ill-at-ease with those who do not share that ethos. Our schools are being mechanized; but intelligence itself cannot be automated. What we need is not a war on poverty, but a war on the *poverty of spirit*; not manpower but hu-manpower retraining.

National Objectives and the Poverty of Spirit

The present war on poverty is a rather muddy affair, many parts of which duplicate existing programs and thereby hamper their effectiveness as well as its own. I think we should call for a clear statement of measurable and realizable objectives for the war on poverty. In sum, the man who is now poor, ignorant, resistant or inert should by 1975 have as full a life as his energy and this culture can combine to make possible. I would propose that the objectives of this program be grouped under three headings.

By 1975, every American should:

HAVE	BE ABLE	DESIRE
Books, magazines	To read	To find answers to his questions, at any level
A job	To perform it	To understand what it means within our society
A radio, TV or musical instrument	To make it perform for him	To gain the enjoyment that music brings, or to select radio or TV programs that minister to his deeper wants

Or, let's get even simpler:

Running water plumbing	To use it	Cleanliness and sanitation
A cook stove	To cook	A wholesome diet he can relish
Electricity	To channel it into effective instruments	To use them creatively
A tablet	To write or draw	To create expressively

These are but a few hasty examples of the kind of statement of objectives that I have in mind. The important thing is that the objective of having - the old Hoover notion of two chickens in every pot, two cars in every garage - is not the answer to America's need. The ability to make use of what we have, and the desire to use it for the creation of a productive personality, are essential; and this is a matter not just of training but of education. The urge to desire - the creative use of what we have, and of our abilities, for the sake of enriching our lives, of making them more interesting, of communicating with the world around us - these are the real objectives of the kind of education which we must provide for our people.

We ourselves "have" resources for education that we have not yet fully developed the ability to use. Book salesmen used to travel the trails of this country selling Bibles, encyclopedias, family medical treatises, and sets of Stoddard's Lectures. The war on poverty might well enlist the services of scores of the firms that are now putting out very useable programmed learning books and inexpensive programmed machines, with rational professional guidance in adapting them to individual needs. The rural churches, granges, missionary societies, ladies aid societies, might very readily be persuaded to make the possession and use of programmed learning materials a matter of pride; and experienced educators could advise them on which ones are viable. County fairs could run contests, with awards for those who had learned the most during the past year about some one kind of thing. This is a simple-minded suggestion, I know. My only intent is to say that we simply have not put our imaginations to work on the conquering of spiritual poverty with anything like the ingenuity we have employed in the effort to reach the Moon and Mars. At this rate, the moon will end as nothing but an exile station for the illiterate crackers, hill-billies, and slum dwellers of whom we despair, only because we ourselves have failed to apply to the communication with them the same skills that we are learning to applyin communicating with our hoped-for fellows in the "starry firmament above", or with bottle-nosed dolphins in the sea around us.

Let me be even more specific about educational television. The League of Women Voters has a civic program. The National Conference of Christians and Jews; B'nai B'rith; the National Council of Churches of Christ; the Japanese-American Citizen's League; and countless other educational organizations - let alone institutions, such as the University evening colleges - are trying by hand-to-mouth methods and doorbell ringing and telephone calling to assemble citizens in the pursuit of the wholeness of their intelligence. At the same time, educational television stations are begging for listeners.

To my knowledge, it has seldom occurred to either side to approach the other with the suggestion of regularly scheduled programming conferences and concerted efforts, to achieve the ends of both through planned and united action. I know few educational television stations that regularly carry programs concerning or in behalf of the labor unions and the movement which they espouse. Radio, except for FM music, has reached its lowest point since the soap opera; it has fallen back on interviews with night people. There is no reason that it should not create - if any creative people still go into radio - programs of commanding and sustained interest based on local issues and national goals.

But note that state appropriations, county and local appropriations, for adult education are undergoing a recent period of decline. New York State two years ago cut its adult education appropriation in half, because the legislators - none of whom had deigned to be clients of such programs within recent memory - accepted the popular mythology that it was concerned solely with underwater basket weaving. The City of White Plains was unable, by assembling representatives of its adult clientele, to produce evidence of the city's desire to continue the adult education program or its belief in the vitality of it. One of my students in an adult education seminar at Teachers College brought me ample evidence that the local directors of adult education are generally selected from, or promoted from, the ranks of those who are not doing anything very useful, but are felt by the superintendent to be people who should be retained within the system - and are therefore assigned to the outer limits of left field, the education of adults.

The University and Continuing Education

The phrase "continuing education" seems to assume that college graduates will go on in the pursuit of learning for the rest of their lives. Current evidence provides little assurance that even students who are in college are there in pursuit of education; a recent survey elicited testimony, from more than half of the students in a large number of colleges across the country, that they were there primarily for social life and fun. I would add, as a second point, that the majority age for undertaking adult learning presents a significant age gap from the twenty-one-year-old college graduation average to the adult of thirty-five or forty. At this point, the individual has established his family and his occupation, and has grown old enough to wonder what he is doing, and to seek the company of others with similar questions in mind, to undertake a new pursuit of education.

I would further point out, as I have recorded elsewhere, that in both San Francisco and Washington, in adult-study groups based on the reading of major original books of the last two thousand years, a questionnaire showed that (a) 80 percent of the participants in these groups were college graduates; and (b) of some 100 major original books that were being read in their groups beginning with the Bible and going on through Plato to Veblen and Whitehead, *almost none* of the participants *had ever read any one* of these books before, in college or out of it. It is difficult to apply the term *continuing* education to the jump from a college education based on meaningless textbooks to an education in maturity based on the reading of the vital products of the leading minds of the past.

What a good college may do for the budding adult was beautifully stated long ago by an English schoolmaster, William Cory: "At school you are not engaged so much in acquiring knowledge as in making mental efforts under criticism. A certain amount of knowledge you can indeed, with average faculties, acquire so as to retain: nor need you regret the hours you spent on much that is forgotten, for the shadow of lost knowledge at least protects you from many illusions. But you go to a great school not so much for knowledge as for arts and habits; for the habit of attention, for the art of expression, for the art of assuming at a moment's notice a new intellectual position, for the art of entering quickly into another person's thoughts, for the habit of submitting to censure and refutation, for the art of indicating assent or dissent in graduated terms, for the habit of regarding minute points of accuracy, for the art of working out what is possible in a given time; for taste, for discrimination, for mental courage and mental soberness."

This kind of learning may indeed be carried over into adult life; there does seem to be some indefinable difference between the college graduate and the high school graduate as one meets them in the corridors of industry, government, business, and social life. We have to remember that *more young people* between the ages of eighteen and twenty-two are *outside* of college than are in it. What equivalent are they being given? Do they learn these same arts through managerial training, military service, and emergency jobs in industry, or as life guards? It seems to me that the major effort which this country must make - our colleagues here have been tossing around sums in the nature of two billion dollars a year - is to *knit up the ravelled sleeve of social intelligence*. This means an all-out motivational drive to re-enlist college graduates and professionals along with the illiterates and the vast proportion of "inert ingredients" - through or with their wives - in the renewed attempt, continuous or intermittent, to understand what the hell they are doing with their lives. I use the phrase advisedly, in the sense in which a nineteenth century preacher of my father's acquaintance announced as the subject of his sermon, "What the Devil He Is, What the Devil He Is Doing, and Where the Devil He Is Doing It."

C.S. Lewis, the English theologian, in a delightful book entitled THE SCREWTAPE LETTERS, has Satan write to one of his earthly ministers that his business is not with men who know what they are doing; his legitimate prey are the men who care only about what is going to happen unto them. Our task is to recruit, from the latter, members for the former. Here, I believe, we leave the division between the ignorant and the educated to confront a new division.

What is"Education"?

I believe that at the base of our confusion is a misunderstanding as to the definition of the word "education".

What is *called* "education" consists of two elements. One is a series of episodes. The other is the intention to learn from them. When both are present, there is a series of *instructive* episodes.

The episodes may be arranged by the learner himself, as when he goes to a play or opens a book to read. Or, they may be arranged for another, or a number of others, by a person who knows how to *maximize the proportion* of instructive episodes in a given series of events. This person is then called an "educator", although in truth he is not the agent of anyone's education but his own. Each man must do his own learning. What the educator does is to *increase the likelihood* of learning by putting its occasions into attractive and regular arrangements or paths.

An unhappy, if unintended, consequence has been that "education" has come to be identified with places, persons, and procedures. Persons reading in libraries, or discussing together on their own, are considered to be pursuing a hobby, not getting "an education".

Finally, we have reached a static image of what "education" requires of us. Originally, in Biblical paraphrase, it has been to inquire deeply, to learn humbly, and to love the quest for truth with all thy heart. Now it has become an assemblage of familiar parts: campus, classroom, and course; teacher, textbook, and test. And, since there was the world's work to be done, only a limited period of pre-vocational youth could be spared for the routines; so education "ended" with the final test and manhood began.

There is a parable, which some of you scientists know, about the experimental psychologist interested in learning theory in the lower forms of life, who experimented with a flea. He wanted to find if a flea could be trained to jump only on command. No command, no jump; say the word, off he goes. He succeeded in training a flea to jump always and only at command. As a good scientist, he pulled one leg off the flea, to see if the training would hold up; the flea still jumped. He continued this process of elimination until the flea had only one leg left. He gave the command, the flea gave a mighty effort and a feeble hop. So the scientist pulled off the last leg. Then he gave the command, and nothing happened. He nodded in satisfaction, went to his desk, and wrote down his finding: "A flea without legs cannot hear." I am wondering if we have fallent into this same logic: An adult without the standard academic paraphernalia cannot learn.

Back to the Elite

While I believe that we can do a great deal more than we have done, I believe that because of pathology, malnutrition, fatigue, pressure and anxiety, and sheer incapacity, we must face the certainty of a permanent non-elite. The abiding influence will always come from those with intellectual and cultural energy and curiosity, whatever their social origins: Multi-media communicators and receivers, who fill their minds through their eyes and ears, and unburden them through their tongues and pens. While the "inert" are our ultimate target, our immediate target is the so-called "educated".

There are millions of words now in print about the necessity of, and the means for, educating all of the American adult population throughout all of its life. It is obvious that such a dream is unreal; but if we are serious in our intention to reach as many people as we can with some kind of educational incentive, a few axioms are basic. I have tried to suggest some of them; let me try here to recapitulate them. It will not be in the order in which they appeared, but rather in the order in which they occur to me now as important.

Education for Citizenship

1. Disregard any standardized notion of the "educated man". All that we seek is to induce incentives to curiosity, creativeness, comprehension, and competence; belief by people in themselves, and, above all, belief of people in each other and in the possibility of achieving the goals they share.

2. Abandon the stereotype of the Protestant-Capitalist ethos as a test for whether or not a man is "educated" or "educable". Rather, we must ourselves, as educators, adopt the approach of a Margaret Mead in the South Sea Islands: study the values of the people with whom we are dealing, and imaginatively create incentives for them in terms of those values.

3. Adapt the most advanced technology that we have - programmed books, inexpensive but professionally selected teaching machines, radio and television, and if necessary bread and circuses, in order to gather people together under the tent of educational salvation.

4. We have to fight not poverty of goods alone, but poverty of spirit. It is life that must become interesting, and an object of curiosity and search on the part of people, many of whom are too tired to care whether they are alive or not. Therefore, it is primarily the young people whom we must attract, with bread and circuses if necessary, to care about what they are going to become. We must have training, to be able to do what we must; but we must also have education, in order to be what we will.

5. Money is the passive necessity in trying to meet this problem. But an active combination of passion and ingenuity is going to be required to instill into the American people what Bertrand Russell called a life "inspired by love and guided by knowledge".

We, here in this Conference, are not going to solve this problem. People like me, in universities like mine, are not going to solve it. Our mutual task is to mobilize the unexplored, unexamined, unimagined resources of this most resourceful of nations; to turn people loose to find their own ways, within their own regions and their own sub-cultures, to find the motivation to care about being alive. They must come to the realization that the uneducated man is simply not alive. Thus our task ranges from motivation to retraining, to motivation to seeing one's own environment with new eyes, to the engendering of curiosity about other ways of living; from the circumscribing actual to the enlivening possible.

This involves also the dissolving of the walls of the incredibly parochial American who sees little farther than his village or town or county, to educate an American who can tolerate being confronted by the complexity of the dynamics of mankind around the whole face of the globe: China, the Congo, all sorts of places that he will never visit and wishes did not exist. For the influential, educated population, the world must be made more real than it is now, by studies of non-Western and other foreign-area cultures. To the man who wants to stay parochial, these influences will seep down, probably in confusing ways; therefore we need to help him organize his intelligence so that new information can be included, disregarded, or placed in perspective.

Our goal is to arouse the thinking power of our democracy. This of necessity involves "horse sense"; but it is not going to be achieved merely by horsepower. This is, in the end, what we mean by education; and to define and implement this is probably the major task facing this nation: above moonshots, above aid to South Vietnam, above medicare for the aged. Whole populations, such as those of southern Greece and southern Italy, have learned to live spiritedly in monetary poverty because they are not poor in spirit. Our own urban studies have raised the question as to whether even slums are necessary sources of poverty of spirit.

Let the war, then, be on poverty of spirit, a war of imagination; let there be a war to induce "the energy of local liberty:" of curiosity, of creativeness, of comprehension. These are the three "c's" of continuing education; and I still believe that it is within our power to invoke their spirit, by the ingenious application of available skills, among the vast majority of healthy Americans.

REFERENCES

1. Follett, Mary Parker, THE NEW STATE. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1934 Edition.

2. Powell, John W., RESEARCH IN ADULT GROUP LEARNING IN THE LIBERAL ARTS. White Plains: The Fund for Adult Education, 1960.

   (A digest of and introduction to the following informative Studies in Adult Group Learning, all published by the F.A.E. in 1960, and available in libraries.)

   Burch, Glen, ACCENT ON LEARNING
   Kaplan, Abbitt, STUDY-DISCUSSION IN THE LIBERAL ARTS
   Davis, James A., A STUDY OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE GREAT BOOKS PROGRAM
   Hill, Richard J., A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LECTURE AND DISCUSSION METHODS

3. Schram, Wilbur; Lyle, Jack; and Pool, Ithiel de Sola, THE PEOPLE LOOK AT EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION. Stanford University Press, 1963.

4. Op. cit.

5. Powell, John W., "Group Reading in Mental Hospitals", PSYCHIATRY, Vol. XIII, No. 2, May 1950. The William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation, Inc., Washington, D.C.

SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS
by
John Powell

I am going to start with the assumption that nobody around this table has ever written the phrase "adult education" with capital initials. As Jack White said, it's a thing that comes last in every educational conference, and yet in my somewhat over-sensitized mind, it is what we have been talking about in very large measure in every one of our sessions.

You cannot talk about the training of teachers without rememvering that they are to some extent adult and that you are dealing with adult education, just as I am in Miami in trying to retrain my faculty.

When Clarence Senior tries to educate the teachers, the parents, the people of New York City, the principals and the superintendents, he is an adult educator, whether he would be ashamed to call himself that or not.

Adult education, in my definition, is the attempt which the American people should be making to communicate with each other and within themselves about their shared purposes and to find solutions to the obstacles in the way of those purposes.

We have been talking here about communicating with teachers in such a way that they would learn to communicate with students who are alien to them. I don't define adult education as beginning at the age of 18. Adult education begins in the nursery school. And this is one reason I'm calling it adult education, although I made the concession in my title of using the word "continuing," because this is now more acceptable. What I regret about the word "continuing" is two things: first, the adult in seeking learning is not continuing anything that the schools have demonstrably done for him. He starts learning again because he's got a problem or he's got a curiosity or he's got a need of some sort or he wants to know why he's doing what he is doing.

And, secondly, the word "continuing" leaves out what I think is the essence of the qualifying word in the phrase "adult education"--the fact that that kind of education, education among grown people, is essentially a search for the means of growing up. It is education for maturity, not just in maturity; and if it is not that, there is no point in calling it education at all, least of all adult education.

There are some threads which I need to pull together here. I think I'd better change my metaphor--they are not threads, they are live-wires.

For example, we have viewed with horror the widening horizontal cleavage across our culture between the enriched who are getting richer and the impoverished who are in danger of becoming poorer. We recognize this as having in it the seeds of a true national disaster. This is a negative current.

Against that we have induced the positive current of the possibilitees of intervention by pre-school enrichment, by school liberation, by new incentives for adults, even by educating teachers who, as Boris very well pointed out yesterday are probably the least educable members of the American people in adult terms.

We have a negative current going through the third wire--built-in resistances to interfering in the family, the sacred family, interferences within the school to reforming it, a resistance on the part of a large part of our population--and I don't mean just the lower class, I mean the eccentrics and the Bohemians and the guys who think for themselves; the resistance to becoming prisoners of authority; the resistance to being compelled to be ambitious; resistance on the part of our institutions to what they consider Federal intervention to the spending of a lot of money, and above all, I think, if we activated the kind of program we have talked about, to what they would consider the socialist implications of such actions.

On the other hand, the positive current, the existence of the money and the power to do this if we could mobilize them. Another negative current; the inconclusiveness of our research, versus positive current, the agreement that we must take action.

Now, I've got two questions to put before you to focus this discussion. Suppose that we were able to identify the effective levers and fulcrums of intervention, knowing that they are risky, are we sure that the gains we would achieve if we won are worth the risks that we would incur if we lost?

I'll put the second question in another way. We are, I think, psychologically in general agreement that the individual makes of himself what he becomes by the use he makes of what is given to him in experience. It's not what happens to him; it's what use he makes of it.

The question I think we've got to face in this final meeting is: suppose we were able to do what we want, what would we as American people be making of ourselves by the way in which we did it?

DISCUSSION
by
Louis Hacker

I should start out by saying at once that I disagree with what Mr. Powell has written, and I suspect I disagree with what he has discussed orally. This does not mean that I denigrate the thoughtfulness of his paper. Indeed, because I do not consider it something that must be give close attention, I have paid it that regard by seeking to analyze what he has said in a systematic form, and by seeking to reply equally, I have written out my remarks in view of the fact that the argument he really presents is a complex one and I think its reply is equally so.

Am I in error, or do I discern the same sense of unease in the comtemplation of our modern world by Mr. Powell that we saw in Mr. Taylor's paper? You recall Mr. Taylor said, in what he called the tensions of our society: "we thus have two separate sets of demands meeting head-on--the demand for an educational system which can deal directly, on a national scale, with themoral and social issues now before us, and the demands for trained manpower to maintain and extend the present economic, social and military establishment."

And Mr. Taylor cited as these issues in one context, "unemployment, full production, national distribution" as having been relevant in the 1930's; and in another, "unemployment, racial injustice, educational inequality, and poverty," alluding to the contemporary scene.

Not specifically referring to the social, military and economic establishment, as Mr. Taylor does, but in effect accepting the same broad frame of reference as the locus of all our woes, Mr. Powell calls for the abandonment of our "Protestant-Capitalist ethos."

For it has produced these consequences:

1. Our slavery to the "conventional wisdom" (which is Galbraith's phrase, not his) by placing the accent on production, which leads, says Mr. Powell, to the creation of "a continuous stream of workers who can keep up with the demands of an advancing technology -- even while those already trained are being laid off by the geometric progression of automation." You will note the key word "geometric". Technology or automation, driven on by the "Protestant-Capitalist ethos" inevitably creates permanent disemployment.

2. Because this is so, Mr. Powell now raises what he calls a fundamental point and he cites Mr. Kirk, whom we have heard, that two classes in our society have emerged; and I may interpolate that by classes the meaning is either in the Burgeon sense, or the Marxian sense, and that these two classes are the affluent and the impoverished or disadvantaged.

3. The first have drive, imagination, a capacity for further learning; the second lack motivation for self-improvement through education because they sense their victimization by the unequal society in which they live.

Therefore, No. 4, should we not, says Mr. Powell, raising the question but inferentially answering in the affirmative, accept the existence of an elite or a meritocracy which will shape that "general will" or, as he says, "national purpose" that will save us all -- the affluent as well as the impoverished or disadvantaged?

And he quotes Mr. Mario Pei in this fashion: "Should there be a directing class qualified as such by reason of intellect, education and general culture, or should there be an unbridled democracy with a nose-counting process to determine what was good and what was bad?"

I do Mr. Powell no injustice when I say he accepts Mr. Taylor's formulation and Mr. Pei's solution, for he declares, on page 18: "Must we learn to accept the concept of a permanent elite?" And he answers: "As automation proceeds, perhaps as small a percentage of the nation can run its industrial plants as now runs its agricultural plant."

I will not argue at this point, because time does not permit, the basic assumptions that lead to these conclusions. I will simply say that I dissent sharply from the assertions that two classes have emerged, the second and hopeless one "impoverished and disadvantaged". Poverty in an affluent society, which is what ours is, is relative. Of course, there are inequalities of income, but we must accept -- given opportunities for escape from fixed status, to enter professions, to start new businesses -- that inequality also means social mobility, and therefore the chance to rise but also to fall.

Further, poverty is only relative for newly-arrived subcultures. This has always been true of all the immigrants; it is true of Negroes coming into the urban communities of the North out of the rural living of the South.

Nor can poverty be measured by a cut-off point in family or individual income. Many incomes, whether of families or individuals, are below the cut-off point for understandable and justifiable reasons without the existence of poverty.

People leave and enter the labor force. This makes for temporary part-time income. The goods and services created which are not measured in market terms on farms, for example, or in the new households of the freshly-married, supplement money income; the small households of the aged; the supplementation of modest incomes from capital on the part of the retired -- all these throw serious doubts on the assumption that 20 percent or 30 percent of our population are impoverished and permanently so.

Mind, I do not deny the existence of small groups of individuals or, in fact, the hard core in our society, or in any society, of persons who have slipped out of the mainstream, but these require individual examination and attention. The problem probably is more social than economic, and these are undoubtedly subjects for social work and possibly rehabilitation or permanent pensioning-off. The last by this process have become pauperized. If they have children, we must seek to snatch them from the same unhappy fate.

And I sharply dissent, too, from the assumption that technology or automation must lead to permanent disemployment of the masses. The history of the West since the fifteenth century has demonstrated again and again that technological improvements and increased productivity, contributed by capital inputs and labor inputs in varying degree have (1) created more jobs rather than less; (2) raised the real gross national product; (3) raised real wages and salaries and the amounts of earnings relative to income from properties. In short, increased productivity -- today the larger part contributed by investment in human beings -- leads to economic growth with all the benificent social and psychic consequences of a volitant, mobile, and adventuresome society.

You must permit another aside. I have introduced a new term here: "investment in human beings." Today economists, notably in our own country, are beginning to examine empirically and theoretically, the contributions made to productivity by an educated manpower. They have come to the conclusion that more and more schooling, whether on-the-job training, in the Armed Forces, in adult education programs, not only advances sharply economic growth but there are important social and psychic side-effects.

Professor T. W. Schultz, of Chicago University, who has been a pioneer in this kind of analysis, says: "Investment in schooling" -- by which he means contributions to production -- "is presently, in the United States, a major source of human capital." And then, turning to the consumption components of education, these, he declares are to be found "in its enduring quality and because of its favorable effects upon the future satisfactions which people enjoy. Moral values, refinement of taste, standards of conduct, and the art of living are all integral parts of this consumption."

What I have said is no digression; for it lies at the heart of the problem. Mr. Powell declares he sees the problem and proposes the remedy. I must now turn to the latter.

It is no accident that Mr. Powell finds his guide or mentor in Rousseau. He might have gone to Plato or to Hegel or to Marx, for man must be forced to be free; or he can find his freedom in a sense of community; or, in Marxian terms, his alienation will end when the relationship of production and the modes of production represent the same common purpose; in short, the goal of adult education is the achievement, says Mr. Powell, of a national purpose.

Says Mr. Powell in the beginning: "The General Will (Rousseau's term) requires a perception of life-long education as a patriot's duty." This he designates as a "national imperative." And he calls upon public authority to launch such a crusade. The Russians have done so in what he admits is "the authoritarian collective programs of mass indoctrination." Twice, although he uses the term "authoritarian", Mr. Powell asks us to examine the Russian experience and not on that account take it lightly.

It has given the Russians what we lack, and that is motivation for accepting education. The assumption is the Russians work better and harder, for they have "mass education for industrial skill, literacy and Communist ideology." Whereas, in our world -- and hence our drift -- "we have been betrayed into educating people for single roles and not for their common humanity."

Again, time does not permit to point out Mr. Powell's want of economic understanding. The lamentable failures in agriculture and in the production of consumer goods have forced the Russians to begin (all the time denying it) to experiment with a market economy, to seek profitability as a touchstone to production, and to reward workers with incentive payments when profitability is achieved, which ironically means the capitalist-consumer sovereignty, and not when production norms are exceeded.

In short, not a general will or a national purpose is going to accomplish growth with all its side-effects, but the capitalist, or utilitarian, enlightened self-interest.

But to return finally to adult or continuing education, Mr. Powell looks at it together with distaste. It is a "gigantic smorgasbord"; the freedom we have is an almost total freedom of often meaningless choices. And as for quality, "Quality control is almost equal to health control in Civil War medicine."

He continues: "It is difficult to build a coherent program of adult learning, a national service for adult intelligence, by adding together the secondary functions branching off from primarily non-adult or non-teaching agencies: the day college, the Armed Forces, the agricultural vocational programs, the church, the Rotary Clubs, the Girl Scouts, or business and industry."

On pages 17 and 18 he offers us a long list of this meaningless and purposeless melange going under the name of continuing education. As though this were not bad enough, we are even in worse plight. By permitting adults to perform in one of many roles -- as a worker or a church-goer, or a consumer -- we have not trained adults "for their common humanity." There is then -- and this I regard as the really ominous statement -- "There is, in fact, no national school, no national market for maturity."

Because, then, we must face the certainty of a permanent non-elite, because technological retraining only leads to geometric disemployment, because we have inequalities of capacity due to "pathology, malnutrition, fatigue, pressure and anxiety" -- in short, impoverishment -- all we can do is educate for citizenship. That is, "induce incentives to curiosity, creativeness, comprehension and competence" to get people to "achieve goals they share." We must, therefore, fight both the poverty of goods and the poverty of spirit.

Needless to say, I reject all this: the social and economic analysis that has caused Mr. Powell's despair, his contempt for the "gigantic smorgasbord" of adult education and his substitution of amonolithic national purpose which he calls citizenship in "shared goals", whether it is the virtue of the Greek freeman (but not the slaves) or the virtue of Machiavelli's elite or the virtue of Rousseau's or Marx's sense of community.

By calling for plurality and not singularity, for consumer sovereignty in the free market of choices and ideas and not the dirigisme and tyranny of the general will; that is to say, when I opt for equality of choices (having in mind different ends) am I opting for the abandonment of quality? Not at all. And here I find the aloofness of the educator and the university as regards adult education the greatest peril.

Curiously enough, recognizing self-interest, the greatest advances being made in adult education today in America are in the Armed Forces and in industry. Both are involved in the training of a superior manpower, the one for national preservation, the other to achieve and maintain profitability and therefore increased productivity.

There are many reasons why adults at all levels, and not simply the already-tutored, seek continuing education in its broadest sense. All should be respected; all can be improved very easily, given our acceptance in a free society of diversity, many instead of a single interest, and manifold forms of participation. I list a few:

Adults seek entertainment. But listening to music, going to the theater, looking at pictures, this constitutes entertainment, too, at the same time that there is a lifting of the spirit.

Adults seek information, whether they visit the museums or engage in current events discussions, or watch so-called public affairs TV programs or programs of educational television.

Adults seek job-improvement.

Adults seek training for civic and community participation, whether as voters or church-goers or members of consumer leagues or civil rights organizations.

Adults seek training for the use of greater leisure time for earlier retirement. Incidentally, the shortening of the time of the work week, of the work year and for the normal life, these constitute perhaps the greatest single boon that technological progress has given us.

What is wrong about education for meaningful travel or for creative writing and painting and the household arts, among which I name cookery as the outstanding one?

And, finally, adults seek -- and more and more should be encouraged to seek (and here I name the greatest single group in our society that we shamefully neglect -- the home-bound married woman) -- they seek formal learning in the broad liberal arts sense, for self-improvement and as an investment in human capital.

In this last case -- and here I have had a long experience -- the want of commitment by our universities and our educational foundations is nothing less than shameful. Mr. Powell agrees, when he says: "You are all aware of the second-class status of our teachers in evening schools and universities; they are likely to be regarded as the 'benighted teaching the belated'."

Need this be so? I will not go into any detail about the accomplishments of the School of General Studies nor discuss, as I should have wanted to discuss in great detail the very problem of how we can redeem and recapture the partially-educated woman into the labor force. I simply want to cite on statistic. There are 6,000,000 women today who have had from one to three years of college education and have dropped out. There isn't a single university, to my knowledge, that is lifting a finger or seeking to develop imaginative ways for, in the first place, reaching these home-bound married women; and in the second place, where their children have grown, inducting them back into normal processes of our society.

I just want to make one comment upon equality and inequality. I say that we can achieve equality only if we are prepared to recognize the equality of the teachers and of the students engaged in this process of continuing learning. If this is so, then quality inevitably follows. Every ancient craft, every midieval guild, every modern profession deriving satisfaction from and being honored for its labors has policed its own quality. We need no public authority, no national purpose to do this.

DISCUSSION
by
Ernest van den Haag

As the last, I am a little undecided whether I should be the poison in the tail or the sweetness at the bottom, but I leave it to you to find out which I have chosen.

I am glad Mr. Hacker preceded me. He criticized a number of the economic and other things which I will have no time to deal with and which I think could be commented on.

Let me start by saying I don't thing Mr. Powell has provided us with a clear definition of adult or continuing education which we can use. So provisionally, let me say that I also mean by this, the schooling of adults; that is, whatever happens to them in a school in which they have enlisted, when it does not lead to the traditional liberal and professional degrees. For this is a separate division, and I think this is what we really want to talk about.

To my knowledge, about 28,000,000 adults are enrolled in this sort of process. The figures are vague and not very useful because enrollment may mean anything from one hour a week to full time, and proper distinctions have not been made, and statistics are not very good. I just want to indicate the approximate size of the enterprise.

Now, it seems to me that what we want to offer, and to whom we want to offer adult education, and what results we seek, should depend on questions such as these: Who demands adult education, and for what purpose? What kind of adult education does he demand? Is the demand rational, in the sense that adult education is such as can be offered as a suitable means to achieve what is in the minds of the people who want to use it? That's what we mean.

In other words, does the end justify the means, if you want to put it that way. I don't think means can ever be justified by anything but the ends.

So the only question is: does this end justify these means? Is the demand for adult education increasing? And what causes its variations, to what factors can they be related, such as income, previous education, occupation, employment and so on.

Demands on the supply side -- how is this demand supplied? Is it over-supplied? Is it under-supplied in the various categories? Should we attempt to stimulate this demand and should we influence the kind of demand? That, of course, depends finally on what effects we intend to have by means of adult education and what do we get, as distinguished from what we intend? Are the effects we get desirable or undesirable?

Now, I think it's best, perhaps, to divide our adult education, as I have a tendency to divide all education, into at least three categories.

First, education as an investment; that is, of a kind that leads to a private return to the person who has been educated. In the terms of adult education, this is usually the case for vocational education, if it is any good. If it is not, it has missed its point.

A person who wishes to acquire a skill in adult education usually does so because he thinks his time is well invested because, with this skill, he can get a higher return. It follows from this that this sort of adult education should not be supported by public money. Obviously, the person who gets the higher return can finance it himself, although we might help him by means of loans.

Second, there is a public indivisible return. This, too, is a kind of educational investment. For instance, if the adult is not literate and by means of adult education he becomes literate, the return is in large part not to him but to society at large, in the same way if I have a telephone and other people also have telephones, I benefit. The telephone serves as a means of communication. Of course, the same is true for literacy.

Finally, adult education can be a form of convention; that is, it does not give any sort of return other than the enjoyment that the person being educated gets from the process of education or from its pursuit. Such a convention can be public sometimes, but most of the time it is private. I certainly would disagree with Mr. Powell on his general idea that most of it is some sort of either public investment or public consumption. I think that is certainly not the case.

Whether and what kind and to what extent we should foster adult education depends on the analysis of these questions. To my knowledge, they have been touched on in Mr. Powell's paper, but he has not come to grips with them.

Mr. Powell does deplore what he considers an insufficient demand for adult education. But he does not cogently explain why there should be more demand. Why, in short, is this use of resources in some way superior to the present uses of resources for society, or for the individuals concerned, and to other possible alternative uses other than adult education?

Now, I want to suggest possible reasons for the lag in demand, if there is one. First, people may be uninformed about the possible benefits of adult education, of the possible net advantage that they may derive from it.

Second, they may be informed but too weak in some way. That is, they may know that it would benefit them but are still unable to undergo the effort, though capable.

Third, people may feel that there is a net disadvantage; that is, that they have better uses for their time resources. These better uses may, for instance, be in formal education, or by means other than educational institutions, such as schooling. They may go to moves and learn more -- unlikely, I will admit; but they may read a book and learn more, which is fairly likely.

Fourth, they may think that there are other uses of the time resources that are unrelated to education but which nevertheless give them a net advantage over the employment of their resources in education.

Finally, there may be people incapable of profiting from further education, even though there would be a net advantage for them if they were capable of profiting from it.

My main objection to Mr. Powell's approach is that he recognizes only the first of these five possible reasons for lack of demand. In fact, he proceeds as though the only reason for which there is no more demand for adult education is that people are not informed about the possible benefits and he proposes,therefore, a vast program of "motivational advertising" and emotional reconditioning that would make everyone want more adult education.

If such a program were to succeed to seduce more people into getting more adult education, then, according to Mr. Powell, we can expect all kinds of wonderful things; for instance, people would elect the right president. I think this is a basic misunderstanding of the influence of knowledge on political events.

I submit that this whole approach is salvationist in character. Such approaches are usually based on the evidence of things not seen. But this one has the distinction of being contrary to the evidence of things as I see them.

Now, the evidence that this is salvationist in approach is, first of all, that everybody is to be saved on the basis of Rousseau's general will. Even those who resist are to be forced to be free. Incidentally, I wonder by whom? By "the general will" Rousseau certainly did not mean the majority. So, if we are forcing people to be free here -- whatever that may mean -- we have to have some minority that in some way knows the general will, as it used to know the natural law, and forces people to be free as they see fit.

Now, freedom, and I quote Mr. Powell here, "means to Americans leisure, affluence, security from war, and pursuit of happiness." This is one of the funniest, most peculiar definitions of freedom I've ever seen.

Freedom means, and always has meant, and can hardly mean anything else, unless we want to limit the word, than the ability to choose. It may very well be that Americans use their freedom to choose the things that Mr. Powell says they choose. It doesn't mean that freedom means that; it means that they use freedom for this purpose.

Now, the curious effect of Mr. Powell's identifying freedom with the choices that are made by means of freedom is that freedom comes to be abolished. For the desire for freedom means, of course, the desire for the permanent retention of the ability to choose rather than being stuck with anything you have chosen. So, if freedom means no more freedom, if it does not mean the retention of the ability to choose, but simply means the achievement of certain things, such as affluence, security from war, and so on, then what Mr. Powell really is saying is that Americans don't give a damn for freedom. They want to be affluent, they want to be peaceful, and they want to be happy.

Now, I submit you can be affluent, peaceful and happy without being free, and you can also be free without being affluent, happy, and peaceful.

My own firm belief is that Americans, however incorrectly and inarticulately, do have a strong wish to remain free, in the sense of retaining a strong wish to be free to choose and change their mind. And I wouldn't exclude the possibility that at some point they might choose, whether you or I like this or not, to give up, say, a peaceful existence in favor of war if certain other values are threatened.

Just as there is a curious mis-definition of freedom, there is a similarly misleading definition of education. The goals of education are defined in some way as finding out or helping people to take a stand on Michelangelo and Picasso; determining the objectives of this nation. Mr. Powell asks: "Does this nation have any objectives which are either measurable or definable in behaviorable terms, for the responsible members of its adult population?" The implication here is clearly that we ought to have such objectives, and that education should bring about that we have the right objectives. To my mind, this is a very mechanical approach.

Mr. Powell also says: "There is, in fact, no national school, no national market, for maturity." I don't know what maturity means. It's a term very useful in horticulture, but I think it has no place in education.

Mr. Powell goes on to say that "Motivational psychology has learned the skill of selling toothpaste but not of selling manhood." I haven't the slightest idea whether it would be desirable to sell manhood. Who would do the selling? What would be involved?

Mr. Powell adds: "In the nation which invented and perfected the radio and television commercial, we should be able to mobilize the same skills to reduce not dental, but mental cavities by 35 percent," which is, I think, what fluoridation is supposed to do. But I do think there is a difference, and I think this difference has been neglected. I am quoting this not to make an esthetic objection, but to indicate that the approach is one that totally misses what I regard as the problem. It misses it because education is used in two different and inconsistent ways.

The first is this: education as an ideal, always successful, producing always an intended and desirable result and capable of solving all human problems, and by definition therefore preferable to any other use of resources.

The second definition which I favor because it is descriptive is: education, a schooling at best a faltering learning process, which even if intended to produce desirable results need not produce them at all and may produce unintended and undesirable ones.

I may add that I know that there is no known predictable effect on character of education and there is no known capacity, to my knowledge, to do more by means of education than to spread knowledge, form intellects, as distinguished from character to some extent, and formulate or form cognitive habits. All this great talk which I find in Mr. Powells' paper about sound education for the right kind of character, and so on, is undoubtedly a nice ideal, but it belongs in a church -- that is, where you feel that miracles are going to be wrought by means of faith.

This leads me back to the formulation of Rousseau on which I think Mr. Powell's paper is based. Rousseau at one point says: "Man was made happy and good. Society corrupts him and causes his misery." If we accept that man is originally happy, good, and capable of learning, and the wicked ones are people who reason badly, then we come to the conclusion that by teaching people how to reason well we will remedy all the problems of the world. This is an interesting conclusion.

I do not think that what is wrong with man is lack of education. Nor do I think that Stalin was led astray by bad educators or Trotsky or Mussolini, who for that matter was a teacher himself. In other words, I do not think that the influence of education is at all what is constantly assumed by the salvationist approach.

I think that the Augustinian approach, that is, that man is corrupt owing to the original fall, reproduced by Freud in slightly different terminology, is a realistic one. And if we accept that, then we might possibly come to a more realistic form of adult or any kind of education.

Some people can profit more and some less, and the profit tends to be intellectual and not in terms of character. Not only Mr. Powell, but no one at all at this conference has talked about the possible undesirable effects of using more resources for education. For instance, one may foster ambition more than one fosters the capacity to fulfill it. This certainly leads not only to unhappiness but to very grave social consequences. One may, by means of more education, lead to more homogenization. One may further destroy family bonds that may have some value. One may foster the tendency that the family has now to place responsibility on institutions, such as the school that cannot possibly bear that responsibility.

Here let me point out, if I may digress for a moment, that I am very interested in the pre-school and pre-kindergarten approach. I wish to indicate that this approach will tend to minimize the influence of the family. Although I am aware that a great deal of research has been done on this, I may point to a classic piece of sociological research undertaken by Kingsley Davis that I am sure you all recall, on a child that was isolated altogether for the first six years of her life -- so much so that the child didn't learn how to walk, how to speak, and behaved like the typical wolf-child. This child in two years of education, from the age of six to eight, was totally normalized. If that means anything -- unless Mr. Davis made this whole thing up -- it means that even if an education up to the sixth year is altogether neglected, this "neglect" can be made up after the age of six. It does not seem to me, therefore, that as far as the cognitive faculties are concerned, it is required that there be pre-school intervention.

I don't mean to say that it is necessarily bad. Obviously, we ought to do a little more research on the effects of pre-school programs before we engage in them to any significant degree. On the whole, I should say that Mr. Powell's paper has strengthened by resolution to apply to the Ford Foundation for a grant to study the negative effects of education.

RESPONSE

by

John Powell

I want to thank Louis Hacker for giving some of my favorite phrases the most eloquent reading I've ever heard. But I would like ot confess that I seem to share with Edgar Friedenberg the unhappy knack of having what I write playfully taken seriously.

I am, for example, serious in the quotation from AE on the cover of this paper; I believe that has meaning.

The references to Rousseau include the fact that the general will is not the same as the will of all, which applies specifically to compulsory education of children and their reacto it.

I don't believe that I have assumed that the elite is necessary. In fact, on page 18 I said I'm not yet prepared to believe this, although later I say that we have to face the permanence of a non -elite.

As to Rousseau, I do take seriously the abstract notion of a general will. I do not regard it as a dictatorial will, because Rousseau himself guard it adequately against that. I am using as concomitant with it the sense of a national purpose. I am free to say, after 30 years of working with the most advanced kinds of adult education and the most bewildered intelligent and well-educated people that I know, that the lack of a purposive structure for the learning of people beyond the years of schooling really incicates that this nation does not know what its purposes.

Taylor said we buy what we want and that shows that we want moon-shots. I am saying we look for what we feel the lack of, but we don't knowwhere to look and we have not effective or few effective places to look for it.

When I say that, let us not take it lightly because it resembles the Soviet Union, I am referring to a contemporary American experiment going on at Norfolk at the present time--the connection of the literacy training with the seeking for job improvement. But don't overlook the figures on the manpower retraining program in which $435 million produced 5,000 trainees in the first two years.

As to whether the shorter work-week is a boon or not, as to whether home-bound women seek adult education for the greater benefit of themselves and the nation, I seriously doubt, as I have known a great many of them. I have known women who place their children in what we have touted here as nursery schools and day care centers, which are really wholesale baby-sitting at retail rates, while they go home and watch television and put their hair up in curlers and go to the supermarket. I do not find that most home-bound women make creative use of their leisure time. In fact, I want to make a distinction between leisure and idleness. Idleness is empty. Leisure is doing something that means something to you; that is, as I said, makes life interesting and makes you more interesting to yourself.

I'm skimming here. I gathered from Dr. van den Haag that he felt that the education of adults was primarily schooling. I have objected before in this conference to the restriction of the word "education" to what goes on in classrooms and I do deplore the fact that about two-thirds of the adults actively engaged in consecutive study are doing so in order to get degrees and credits. Universities are taking over the adult education pattern. I am not altogether averse to that. But it seems to me that so much more than schooling is involved.

A book is also coming out soon by a colleague of Peter Rossi's, John Johnston, called "Volunteers for Learning", which is a most interesting statistical analysis of an extensive study projected to 23,000,000 American individuals who were in some way or other intermittently or regularly furthering their own learning. More than half of these were doing it by themselves; a lot more by correspondence.

Johnston did not get figures to incluse the anywhere from 5 to 10,000,000 adults who regularly or intermittently watch their favorite programs on educational television, or even take courses at the junior college level in Chicago, in their own living-rooms.

Where I speak of Michelangelo or what to do about this or what to do about that, you will note that I am not making assertions; I am raising questions. What do we think the purpose of education is? How would you judge our national purpose? How would you judge an educated man--this way or that?

As for maturity, this to me is a fighting bird. The maturity of any species is the full development of capacity in the individual to use the powers which are needed and peculiar to that species. Man's native and peculiar power is the building of societies, through communication; and the mature person is one who communicates with candor and precision in the interests of the advancement of the social group, society, state or world in whcch he lives. The man who is not doing that will soon come to be regarded in our public as a slacker.

I am not advocating that education become a prime insgrument of national purposes. I am saying it has done that. As Clark Kerr said about the university, it is no longer a free institution. It is no longer free to criticize what the establishment is doing. It is bound to do what the establishment wants. This I deplore very seriously.

And by maturity I mean that which can be achieved through thought, through communication about serious things. So much for that.

ADDITIONAL QUERIES AND COMMENTS

Judson Shaplin: In your comments did I hear you say that teachers were the most hardened against adult education?

Powell: They were the most difficult subjects for liberal adult education if, as I say, it is informal or in any way eccentric.

Shaplin: I wanted to point out that teachers are the most saturated with adult education of any segment of the population. In other words, we have gone through a period of 30 years of the uplife of the whole teaching segment. It's tied to salary schedules. They are the consistent, persistent summer-school-goers; they are the university-extension-goers for degrees There is all of this.

Sloan Wayland: The presumed paradox of quality and equality can be seen most clearly in the data on the population who are outside the formal school structure, and I think gives rise to the kind of concern that Mr. Powell has, if not to the solution which he suggests.

If we look at the school system itself, any assumption of equality, in the narrow sense of the term, is likely also to be extended, the more attention we give to remedial work for those who have been suffering disadvantage. That is to say, any kind of knowledge which we develop to help those students who are handicapped at the outset, it it is fundamental knowledge, will be adapted and expanded by those who already have advantages from their home background and other sources.

The suburban school will pick up any kind of information and experience which has been developed in other setting, if it is really fruitful, and extend it. It may be, therefore, that a possible consequence of all the work that we do on this will not be to reduce differences but in fact to extend them.

And I say I think it is clearest on the adult education level, but I think it would also be true at the school level, as well, regardless of the kind of steps that we take.

Hacker: I will not accept seriously Mr. Powell's statement that he was jesting, because Rousseau by that token is not to be taken as jest, nor is Marx, nor is Hegel, nor Plato, for that matter.

When he said "General Will" and quoted properly what Rousseau meant by "General Will" then I tax him with dirigisme or, if you will, an authoritarian society in which somebody will tell us what the national purpose is.

In a free society I wil not tolerate anybody telling me what the national puroose is and how I shall commit myself to it.

I also want to comment on what Wayland said. It is true as a result of the deplorable want of interest on the part of educators in further education, we do have participation voluntarily on the part of those who have already gone through part of the educational round.

Powell: That is true. But you note in my paper I cited the very impressive and exciting activities of the Armed Forces and of inductry, and I regret exceedingly that educators have made no effort to familiarize themselves with their approaches and their achievements.

They have started out,in the Armed Forces, granted proper physical capacity--with literally, in many cases, the wholly-untutored--they have taken them and pushed them through the whole round of education and, where capacity has been indicated, taken them to the highest levels of technology.

Businessmen accepting that same commitment, because of profitability-- and I said enlightened self-interest--have applied themselves to the same problems.

If the educators at large will take on exactly the same kind of attitudes and devices of the Armed Forces and of business itself in its in-service training, we shall be much farther advanced in this whole program of continuing education, to which we all give lip-service and which notably the universities wholly reject.

A Voice: I'd like to raise a question of Prof. Hacker. Granted that we don't want any kind of burearcracy or authoritarian control in determining who will take what kind of studies, the fact is that adult education is selected by some institution, by some individuals, the nature of it, the program; what criteria shall be employed as to what shall be offered, because the freedom of choice that's available to the consumer, the American person, the freedom is de-limited by that which is available.

Surely some criteria are utilized in determining what shall be offered. In whom shall that power be vested?

Prof. Hacker: Shall I answer in terms of my experiences--and I've had a very long experience.

I was prepared to admit people into the School of General Studies at the formal collegiate level without high school education. There is an example of both.

The choices are very wide, depending upon the courage, integrity and willingness of the universities to accept such a responsibility.

I need only say this: the reason why I had rein was because I was making two million bucks a year net for the university and had my own budget.

Mayer: Very briefly, I would like to put the quality argument in here a little, my own hunch being that one of the reasons why we do so poorly is that most of the stuff is not much good. This is true of what is offered in the formal courses and it is certainly true of what is offered over television. It is just generally true. The great books discussion group sort of thing is a kind of hunger that people feel they ought to have, but when they get to the kind of cardboard that is involved in this, the hunger tends to go away.

van den Haag: What disturbs me, is that Mr. Powell seems to be under the impression that there is something that could be an ideal, that can be called the full development of all our capacities, and I quote, " in the interest of advancement of society."

Now our capacities are many. I have the capacity to murder, to be malicious, to steal, and so on. Perhaps these are generally disapproved, but if Mr. Powell and I were to discuss which of my capacities are best to be developed, we would not agree. And therefore I think it is a mistake to act as though this phrase mean that we all know what we want. We don't.

And again the same thing about the advancement of our society. Mr. Powell should have certainly noticed that we have very different notions of not only how society but how education is to be advanced. So how can one seriously say that education has a goal of helping people to advance society, as though it meant something to know?

The most that education can have as a goal is to help people think a little bit more clearly.

Powell: The Conference itself has been as good an example of an adult education experience as I could offer you for illustration. This has been a meeting of diverse minds with diverse backgrounds seriously considering a very serious problem, doing it maturely and good-naturedly and making progress.

Out of it have come certain suggestion. One was that we might intervene, as the Chinese have and as the Russians have--and therefore I use those references--with children at as early as six months. If we were to intervene massively to mobilize our psychological knowledge, our Federal funds, our community influence, our industrial might, even our advertising might, to h the achievement, even if we had come to an agreement as to what should be done, we might by doing it turn ourselves into another kind of society than the one we are.

Mussolini was a product of the Italian ecucational system; militaristic Germany was a product of the German education; Lenin of the Russian educational system. We are talking about products of the American educational system and what are we going to make of it by the way in which we try to do what we think ought to be done. This I think is a question for permanent discussion. It's a question of the general will and it's a question of the general welfare.

We've got to choose what kind of people we're going to become by the way we do what we think has to be done, and I am only saying that choice has got to be thoughtfully made and greatly made.

THE ECONOMIC COSTS OF QUALITY AND EQUALITY IN EDUCATION

Seymour E. Harris
University of California, La Jolla

At the Conference there was general agreement that large additional resources would be needed to provide the desired quantity and quality of education. The emphasis was first on what might be done to improve the education of the disadvantaged, especially the Negroes, and, secondly, the gifted children.

Basing themselves largely on Bloom's study, Kirk and others stressed the need of starting education of the disadvantaged at age one or two, an extension supported by the Bloom conclusion that 40 per cent of intellectual development takes place between conception and age four, about 30 per cent between ages four and eight, and about 20 per cent between ages eight and 17. The fact that aptitude tests reveal low scores for Negroes does not suggest low intelligence but rather unfortunate environmental conditions. The Negro and other low income groups, as a result, may well find the school experience distasteful and rebel against the system, a reaction likely to be reflected in increased juvenile delinquency.

Kirk shows that there are already at least 36 approaches to the problems of improving education for the disadvantaged and the gifted, advances related both to inter-individual differences and the varying rate of growth, that is, infra-differences.

Obviously such attempts to improve our educational system are likely to be expensive. If, for example, we assume that 30 per cent of our school children are disadvantaged and would be eligible for four pre-kindergarten years and also that the four years of additional schooling would cost no more than the average school year per pupil in the public schools costs now, then the price tag would be approximately $7 billion.

But financial needs are not exhausted at this point. An important goal is to raise the standards of school systems with relatively low outlays per pupil. Such improvements would also help the disadvantaged for they reside to a considerable extent in the states spending relatively little for education. The average current outlay per student for the 1963-64 was $455, with the maximum $705 in New York and the minimum $241 in Mississippi. To raise the expenditures per pupil to the $455 average for 26 states with outlays less than $455 would require $1.7 billion additional. Inclusive of capital the figure would be almost $2 billion. Should we seek to match the top nine states, then the additional costs for the 17 million pupils in the non-impoverished 26 states would be around $4 billion inclusive of capital.*

Nor does this give us the complete picture of needs. To comprehend the dimensions of the problem, it is necessary to consider the trends of expenditures in recent years.**

All Expenditures, Public Schools

1919-20	$ 1,036
1949-50	5,837
1959-60	15,613
1961-62	18,330
1969-70 (Projected)	33,600**

Demands for education are likely to rise. Here is a projection for 1970:-

All Expenditures on Education, Inclusive of Higher Education and all Private Schools

	$ Billions	% Gross National Product
1. 1949	8.8	3.4
2. 1963	33.7	5.8
3. 1970 (Estimate)	64.0	8.0

The 1970 estimate is based on the following assumptions:-

1. GNP will rise from the probable level of $650 billion in 1965 to $800 billion in 1970. This increase would roughly equal the $150 billion rise from 1960-65, but a rise at a somewhat lower rate of 23 per cent as against 30 per cent in 1960-65.
2. I assume $7 billion additional expenditures for the under-privileged, raised to $8 billion to correspond with the increase of GNP from 1963-1970.
3. I include $5 billion to raise the outlays of the low expenditure states to the level of the richer states. This total is inflated by $4 billion by the rise of per capita income since the early 1960's.
4. I include $7 billion, a $1 billion rise per year, for higher education.
5. Relevant also is the projected increase of expenditures on public schools proposed by the N.E.A. from $15.6 billion in 1960 to $40 billion in 1970.

---

*The calculations are mine. I have relied on Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Digest of Educational Statistics, 1964 Edition; National Education Association, Financing the Public Schools, 1960-1970; Statistics of State School Systems 1961-62, Final Report, 1964; National Committee for Support of the Public Schools, Changing Demands on Education and Their Fiscal Implications.

**Estimate by N.E.A. on the assumption of a generous rise of enrollment of 29.5 per cent in the 1960's, of average classroom salaries from around $5000 in 1960 to $9710 in 1970 and a rise of current expenditures per pupil enrolled from $341 to $720.

(I allow for capital expenditures equal to 20 per cent of the current outlay, a rate substantially less than in 1960.) On this basis the increase of outlays on public schools would average $2.5 billion per year.

Another approach is to estimate the increase of all expenditures on education, inclusive of private and higher education, and to project on the basis of this trend. These outlays rose by $2 billion per year in a period of 14 years but increased to $2.7 billion in the year 1963-64. Hence by 1970 we may assume a rise of $17.5 billion (7 times $2.5 billion).

Here, then, are the possibilities for additional expenditures by 1970:

1. $8.5 billion for the under-privileged, age 2 - 5 inclusive.
2. $5 billion to raise standards of impoverished states to those of higher income states.
3. $7 billion to increase current and capital outlays for higher education.
4. $25 billion assumed rise based on N.E.A. projections of need. (My estimate of capital sum.)

In all, the total equals $45.5 billion.

An alternative is to base our needs on (1) and (2) above, and to add an estimate of needs based on trends of all expenditures on education. The total would then be $8.5 billion + $5 billion + $17.5 billion = $31 billion.

It is clear that the rise of $45.5 billion is excessive: this sum would absorb about 30 per cent of the expected rise of GNP. The average cost of education in 1963-64, in relation to GNP, was only 5.8 percent. Even the less ambitious projection of a $31 billion increase would mean that education would absorb about 20 per cent of the expected rise of GNP. Clearly, the N.E.A. goal is a good one to shoot at, but it is excessive given current tax rates, tax structure and competitive demands on the public economy.

Even the $12 billion estimated cost for (1) the disadvantaged at age 2 - 5, and for (2) raising the educational standards of the less affluent states, would consume eight per cent of the expected rise of GNP. Obviously, the authorities will have to choose among the various needs--general rise of educational standards, help for the disadvantaged, or raising of standards of the less affluent states. The last may lose out in the competition unless the federal government participates to a greater degree than now seems likely. And I remind the reader than any general improvement of standards would help children in the poverty class but yield them less relatively than what they ought to have.

On the assumption that about $2 billion additional will become available each year in the next seven years as in the last 15 years, my guess is that higher education would receive about one-third of the additional sums and that most of the remainder would go to raise salaries and improve standards generally rather than for reducing differentials in standards or appropriating large sums for the very young and disadvantaged. I say this despite the President's announced proposals to launch a modest educational program to help the low income educational districts.

I should add that my projections are much on the optimistic side though pessimistic vis à vis the deliberations of the Conference. The Office of Education, for example, projects all education expenditures from $30.4 billion in 1962-63 to $42.5 billion in 1969-70.*

I believe that a practical goal for additional expenditures on education would be $2 billion, roughly seven per cent of the expected annual gain of GNP; if the federal government were to become active in this field, we might even think as much as $3 billion, or ten percent of the expected annual gain.

Here are the limits of a practical goal. The resources are there. The real question is, are we prepared to allocate eight per cent of GNP and 20 per cent of the rise of GNP from 1963 to 1970 to education? These are the sums required if outlays are to rise $3 billion a year as compared to $2 billion in the years 1949 - 63. It certainly will not be easy to achieve these economic objectives.

Among the obstacles are the opponents of increased expenditures for education; the many people who are fearful of federal control of education; the segregationists who see the expanded role of the federal government as a disguised attempt to force integration; the constitutional issues involved in aid to Catholic schools (failure to include Catholic schools assures opposition of the Catholic groups); the heavy burden of security and other programs; and finally, the widely accepted view that the approach to prosperity and growth is not rising welfare outlays but, rather, reduction in taxation.

If education is to do its job, we shall have to depend especially on the tax base of the state and local governments. The federal government spends only $2.5 billion of the total educational bill of $35 - $36 billion, and only about one-fifth goes for public school education.** The total of $35 billion reflects an increase over the total given by the Office of Education, because most of the federal government outlays are not included in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare total. In view of the barriers to large outlays by the federal government, we shall have to depend upon state and local governments for the major contributions. However, with good leadership by the party in power, the federal government might increase its contribution by $1 - $2 billion by 1970.

I detected an excessive degree of pessimism at the Conference concerning what state and local governments might do. It is well to remember that in the 1950's these expenditures rose from $20 to $50 billion and from $20 to $40 billions in stable prices.

---

* Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Projections of Education Statistics, 1964 Edition, page 32.

** The Federal Government and Education, Washington, D.C., House Doc. No. 159, 1963, pp. 115-116.

The trend in the first three years of the 1960's has paralleled that of the 1950's.

This pessimism of the potentials of state and local finance stems from two sources, first, the inflexibility of the real estate tax, and, second, the regressive aspects of state and local taxes, that is, the heavier burden on low income groups of state and local taxes. But the experience of the 1950's suggests that the inflexibility of the real estate tax has been overemphasized. For in the years 1946 to 1963, new construction of housing units, office buildings and factories amounted to $437 billion, or an average of nearly $25 billion a year; the number of new private non-housing starts in the 14 years 1950-63 totaled more than $18 million, or $1.2 millions per year, and the yield of the property tax jumped from $5 billion in 1946 to $19 billion in 1962.* The reassessment of property taxes contributed to the rise of state and local revenues at higher levels than most economists had anticipated in the 1930's and 1940's. That does not mean that we could not do much better, especially if more progressive state and local tax structures were introduced. I should add, however, that the progressive federal tax structure reduces the sting of the state and local tax system.

One of the difficulties of relying excessively on state and local governments is the great differences in capacity to pay among state and local governments. Thus in the Southeast, public expenditures on elementary and secondary education in 1963-64 amounted to 4.51 percent of personal income, and in the rich North, only 4.15 percent. Personal income per school child was $6,842 in the Southeastern states and $9,740 in the North Atlantic states. The extremes were $13,253 in New York and $4,851 in Mississippi.** In the absence of federal aid, the children in the low income states--where a large proportion of the disadvantaged reside--are deprived of high standard education, not only because of the low income in these states, but also because educational costs in relation to personal income are high indeed. The unavailability of large-scale support from the federal government condemns the children of these states to a second class education. These are the same states that especially need help in financing pre-school education, and they are not likely to get it unless the federal government intervenes.

In the course of our deliberations, much was said about the need to improve the status of our teachers. This is not by any means merely a matter of economics. Through an improvement in the economic status of the teacher would help, both Messrs. Mayer and Schaefer noted that teachers' income was not at a satisfactory level. Though there was a period during the war and post-war periods when teachers' incomes lagged behind the rise of prices and, a fortiori, in relation to personal incomes, their current real income vis à vis the general working population is at least as high as in the pre-war period. Given the large increases in demand for teachers, it may still be that teachers' incomes are inadequate to elicit a response in supply and quality consistent with our goals.

I should add that there is an even more serious income lag for college teachers. In the early 1960's the real income of college teachers had risen higher than pre-war levels, but since the whole population had increased its real per capita income by about 80 per cent since before the war, the relative position of college teachers had deteriorated by about 30 to 40 per cent. In view of the increase in the college population by about 100 per cent in the 1960's, the flow of teaching talent is not likely to be sufficient in the absence of substantial improvements in salary scales.*

---

* Statistics from Economic Report to the President, 1964

** Digest of Educational Statistics, 1964, p67.

One of the problems that especially concerned me in the deliberations at the conference was a tendency to minimize the economic issues. Harold Taylor and Milton Mayer, especially seemed to me to err in this way. Of course, simply pouring dollars into education is not going to solve our problems. A rising supply of dollars and a fixed flow of resources means inflation, not progress. Surely the adequate economic resources are a necessary, if not a sufficient condition. To obtain the fullest cooperation of the teacher it is necessary to pay him well; but it is also necessary to elevate him to a higher position in the society. He must have an income adequate to establish his economic position; but he must also have security, prestige, time for learning as well as teaching, time for vacation and travel, prizes for distinguished work, etc., and freedom from chores.

Teachers' pay is undoubtedly low compared with other occupations requiring equivalent preparation, e.g. physicians, engineers and lawyers. The contrast is especially striking in relation to physicians, for the practising physician earns about four times as much as the average school teacher, an excess much above the amount required to offset the higher costs of training of doctors. The issue is complicated by a high degree of restrictionism among physicians, and an interference with markets that teachers are unable to impose even if they wished. It is of some interest that in Great Britain the income of physicians is only about 20 per cent in excess of that of college teachers, but in the United States about 200 per cent more. In the latter country restrictionism is in vogue; in the former, the government indirectly determines wages by imposing capitation fees in a manner that provides doctors with incomes commensurate with those of other professions requiring similar education and training.**

The problem of teachers' pay is not only the inadequacy of salaries, given the objective of wider educational opportunity and improved quality, but also the failure to use effectively the total salary fund. Differentials in pay are almost universally justified on the basis of experience and academic degrees. But payment on the basis of merit is almost universally not allowed, the theory being that the contribution or quality of the teacher cannot be evaluated. So far has the campaign against merit or incentive increases gone that even when serious shortages prevail and unfortunate gaps in the curriculum occur, the school administrators do not pay higher salaries to attract the needed teachers. With the great shortage of mathematics teachers, there is much to be said for paying mathematic teachers more than other teachers, though teachers object to this kind of "discrimination." Their attitude is that if it is necessary to pay these teachers 25 per cent more, then all salaries should rise by 25 per cent. In other words, instead of raising the salary budget by 2.5 per cent on the assumption that the mathematics teaching budget is one-tenth of the total teaching budget, the proposal is that all salaries rise by 25 per cent. The obvious result is great shortages of mathematics teachers since the budget committees are not prepared to pay 10 times as much as is necessary to obtain the additional mathematics teachers.***

---

* S. E. Harris, Higher Education: Resources and Finance, 1962, Ch. 52, N.Y. McGraw Hill, 1962

** See Economics of American Medicine, New York, Macmillan, 1964, especially Chs. 7, 9.

*** See especially Kershaw and McKean, Teacher Shortages and Salary Schedules, 1962, Chs. 3, 10.

One possible approach to differential pay is the use of teams of teachers, as Prof. Trow suggested. In this case, the first teachers may be the team leaders, and differential pay scales may be tolerated.

In higher education similar problems arise, for the dominant tendency is to allocate large parts of any increase in the faculty budget to all members of the faculty, good and bad. Many will argue that the tenure system requires this kind of a salary policy. But on the whole, higher education does allow a substantial amount of pay differential, more on the basis of research accomplishment than of teaching; and the differential prevails not only in salary but also in the age of achievement of rank. The scientists, for example, in shortest supply, tend to achieve tenure at a much earlier age than the humanities professor.

Mayer, in particular, noted the large increase in expenditures on education, and from this he inferred that the problem is not the shortage of funds. For example, from 1900 to 1956 public school expenditures rose from $215 to $10,995 million dollars, or by 50 times; and from 1956 to 1964 to $21.4 billion. In higher education, the increase was from $ 1/2 billion for current expenditures in 1929-30 , to $7.2 billion in 1961-62, or a 13-fold increase. But the conclusions are not equally impressive if the expenditures are deflated by relevant price and adjusted for the numbers of pupils being educated. Then we will find, as Hirsch did, that daily per pupil expenditures in stable dollars were virtually unchanged from 1906 to 1958, and in higher education the rise of outlays per student has not kept up with that in per capita income, that is to say, in relation to the rising standard of living, education has fallen behind.*

The main determinants of educational outlays are (1) the methods of financing, (2) the relative responsibilities of the different levels of government, (3) and the choice of alternative areas of spending. If, say, $1 billion additional revenue is available, should it be spent on education, on housing, on health, on security, on jobs, or on what?. The issues here are partly ideological. Even if the objective is to raise the status of the under-privileged, it is not clear that education has the first priority. As a matter of fact, without health, housing and jobs, the contribution to the general welfare of a given additional outlay on education may be greatly diluted. Moreover, considering each welfare field, we tend to exaggerate the net contribution of each category of spending. The example of the under-developed countries is instructive here. Given their economic levels, they tend to spend excessively on education and neglect other areas, which, if adequately developed, would raise the contribution of education.

This reminds me of the fact that there was virtually no discussion at the seminar of the importance of education as an investment, both in raising the income of the individual and that of the nation. Insofar as the results are favorable to the nation, we refer to these gains as external economics--e.g. the education of scientists raises the income of the scientist, and the gains spill over to the people as productivity rises and security is enhanced.

---

* See Health, Education and Welfare Digest of Educational Statistics, p61, p100; Health, Education and Welfare Higher Education, Receipts, Expenditures and Property, 1957-58, 1961, p5; S. E. Harris, Higher Education: Resources in Finance, 1962, Ch. 1; S. E. Harris, More Resources for Education, 1960, p14; and W. Z. Hirsch, Analyzing the Rising Costs of Public Education, 1959, p34.

Evidence of different kinds suggests a high association between education and income. The comparison may be that of per capita income and educational achievement, e.g. (1) the college graduate of 1965 may look forward to a life time income of roughly $200,000 over the non-college graduate; or (2) of average education and incomes of states or nations; or (3) of an assessment of the factors contributing to growth. On the last comparison, Denison has estimated, though with a degree of precision not supportable by available research, that education accounts for more than 42 per cent of rising productivity.*

It is, in fact, not easy to be too precise in these matters. For example, one investigator discovered that Harvard, Yale, and Princeton graduates had much higher incomes than college graduates generally. Is the explanation the superior quality of education of the "Big Three"? Or is the favorable environmental factors--e.g. the Yale graduate has a special claim to a good opening in his father's or uncle's or friend's brokerage firm?

In this connection, a point made by Professor Flanagan is relevant. We know too little about the input and net output of education. It is surely a less than optimum allocation of resources that our educational budget of $35 billion does not include at least one per cent, say $350 million for research and planning. How much more effectively we could allocate the educational dollars if we knew more about our objectives and methods of attaining them. Do we spend too little or too much on buildings versus our personnel? The appeal of buildings to politicians may greatly exceed their relative contributions to education.

While discussing the economics of education, I should comment on a proposal of Prof. Friedenberg that the parents should be allowed to choose between public and private schools. This proposal, which would provide each parent with tax money needed to purchase the product, is similar to one made by Professor Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago some years ago. Undoubtedly, though the stimulus to competition between public and private schools might well improve the educational process, I am not enthusiastic over this proposal. It would also have the unfortunate effect of destroying the public school system, for the migration to private and especially parochial schools is already a source of concern. Presently, most students at non-public schools receive an inferior education, despite the availability of non-lay teachers paid at lower than market prices. Should the Friedman-Friedenberg plan be introduced, the march to private schools would be accelerated, and the public system endangered. Despite the additional help given to the private schools, the net result would probably not be an improvement of standards.

A number of participants--Powell, Taylor and Rossi--urged strong anti-poverty programs in conjunction with the plans to raise educational standards. Flanagan tells us that the capacity to absorb education varies closely with incomes. I wonder whether a closer association is not to be found between the occupation of the parent and gains in education. Admission to institutions of higher learning seems to be more closely tied to occupations than to incomes. Thus, professional parents have lower incomes than business executives; but the proportion of children of professional parents at colleges is substantially higher than for the business executive class.

---

* E. F. Denison, The Source of Economic Growth of the United States and the Alternatives Before Us, 1962, pp21,73; cf pp60-64 of Introduction to O.E.C.D. Economic Aspects of Higher Education, 1964.

Several members of the session demanded strong anti-poverty programs, but no attempt was made to estimate the costs or the practicability of such programs.

In 1962, 20 per cent of all families were classified in the poverty class. In 1947, the figure was 32 per cent, suggesting a substantial improvement. If we assume that the 12 per cent of families with incomes below $2000 needed $1500 additional to pull them out of the poverty class and those with incomes of $2000 to $3000 needed $1000 additional income each, then $12.4 billion additional income for the impoverished would be needed. These sums would have to come out of transfers (taxes) or out of the creation of additional income through special measures taken by the government to raise the productivity of the workers through improved education, vocational guidance, training, health and housing.

The Johnson administration depends largely on productivity measures rather than transfers. It has some hope of large gains through expenditures of $1 - 2 billion yearly.*

Rossi's proposal for a floor on incomes also has much appeal, but so far it has not been possible to elicit much enthusiasm even for the relatively modest family allowance systems which prevail in Canada and Western Europe.

In our deliberations, the emphasis was on the failures of the administration. Unemployment was high; poverty was still with us; growth had been small, etc. But my appraisal would be that we have had several years of great prosperity. In less than four years, GNP rose by more than $100 billion in stable prices; unemployment had been cut by one-quarter since 1960; a large redistribution of income had been effected in the 1940's with the bottom 20 per cent gaining about 78 per cent of real income, the top 5 per cent only 13 per cent** In November, 1964, unemployment of heads of family had fallen to 2.5 percent in contrast with the shocking 15 per cent for the young worker. And, as noted, poverty families had declined from 32 percent in 1947 to 20 per cent in 1960.

It is important to improve the education of the low income groups. Inadequate education goes with low incomes and unemployment. Thus, in 1962, 35 per cent of the heads of all families had eight years or less of education, and 20 per cent, 12 years or more; but the figures for the poor families (incomes of $3000 or less) was 61 and 7 per cent respectively.***

Automation, which is receiving more and more attention, is widely believed to be destroying millions of jobs. It was to be expected that a conference concerned with quality and equality in education would consider the issues involved in automation. Obviously, if automation destroys jobs by the millions, the nation is going to face the problem of more and more leisure. In response to the threat of automation, labor demands a 30 hour week, longer vacations, more schooling and earlier retirement. If automation is as costly as it is frequently held to be, the implications for education are clear. The student must be trained so that he can use effectively the increased leisure: in music, reading, outdoor recreation, painting, games, etc. It is to be hoped that the net effect will not be to increase the annual mileage on the road from 10,000 to 15 or 20,000 miles per car nor, as my colleague, Professor Schumpeter used to say, to foment strikes and revolutions. Insofar as the increased free time is converted into more schooling, to this extent many of the problems of increased leisure are solved; but the burdens of educational finance are greatly increased as the average period of schooling rises, say from 12 to 14 years. Such an increase would increase the costs of education by almost $6 billion per year.

---

* Cf Economic Report of the President, 1964, Ch. 2

** S. Goldsmith et. al. in Review of Economics and Statistics, 1954, p11

***Economic Report of the President, p61

But we may be over agitated by the automation problem. Productivity rises by almost 2.5 per cent a year. That means the doubling of output every 28 years if the gains are not converted into more leisure. In the last 100 years we have accepted rising productivity more in additional goods and services than in increased leisure. As we attain higher and higher standards, we may seek the fruits of rising productivity more by cutting working hours.

I do want to emphasize one point that was missed at the conference. Automation is not quite the revolution that it has been made out to be. It is merely one manifestation of rising productivity and the annual gains of productivity, e.g. the rise of output per man hour with a given input of labor, capital and management, has not been out of line the last ten years in relation to earlier years. Indeed, serious problems arise when an insurance company, through the use of IBM machines, can achieve with 10 workers what had been previously produced with 100 or 1000. It is imperative that the displaced worker be given a substantial dismissal wage, thus sharing the gains of automation, and that he also be helped to obtain a new job which utilizes his skills.

Despite automation, the economy now has six million more jobs at the end of 1964 than were available in 1959, a prosperous year, and almost four million more than in 1960, a recession year. These statistics point to the over-emphasis of the impact of automation. Let us not forget that the machines were destroyed by workers at the beginning of the industrial revolution of the 18th and early 19th centuries. Yet through it all jobs have increased at a dizzy rate and standards of living have improved correspondingly. As productivity rises, say, three per cent a year, two million jobs are lost. But if demand is kept up through wise policies, the resultant savings are not costly in jobs destroyed, for the rising demand absorbs the displaced workers.

Hence, I would conclude that automation is not the problem it seemed to be to some members of the Princeton colloquium. But the effects on education should not be entirely dismissed. Leisure time will increase, and retraining and reeducation, with greater emphasis on jobs requiring skill, will put more burdens on education. But let us note that the number of hours in manufacturing was 40 hours in 1946 and was still 40 hours 17 years later, in 1963. The public does not seem disposed to increase its leisure at a rapid rate, though from 1929 to 1963 the hours were cut from 44 to 40 and, moreover, workers accept increased leisure in longer vacations and earlier retirement.

On the issue of private output per man-hour, the average increase was 3.2 per cent in the years 1947-63, as compared with 3.5 per cent in 1960-63. These are not large differences.*

The President's Council said it well in its 1964 report:
"Historically, there is surely no evidence of any inability of demand to rise along with production capacity, or of any permanent inadequacy of total job opportunities. Rather, our technologically progressing economy has brought higher output and incomes, and more and better consumption and investment along with the voluntary decision to take some of the fruits of progress in the form of leisure. Since 1929 for instance, output per worker has almost doubled. If total demand had not grown since 1929, and if we were still producing the 1929 level of output, using present methods of production and the present shorter work-week, it would take just 26 million workers to do it. This would leave two-thirds of our present labor force unemployed...".**

Much of the discussion of the seminar gravitated around the evils of the aptitude tests. It is clear that teachers frequently use them in harmful ways. But is not the answer to teach teachers not to abuse them? The general view seems to be that we ought to forego these tests. Yet as a college teacher over 44 years, I am not in agreement with the general position. Sound admission practices contribute towards a more effective use of resources in education. In my opinion, aptitude tests improve the selection of students for college and also result in improved training when the student arrives. Anyone who has studied admission practices and results cannot disavow the importance of the aptitude tests--for example, the student with a low score is not likely to survive and hence frequently is not admitted. The reason for the low score may in large part be environmental; but unfortunately whatever the explanation, a low score has some significance; and a high score helps in the assessment of the student, though with increasing proportions of high scores at leading institutions they are not as helpful as in the past.***

John Gardner spoke out well against excessive reaction against the aptitude tests:
".....Before the use of objective tests, American teachers were susceptible to the same social distortion of judgment.. Against this background, modern methods of mental measurement hit the educational system like a free breeze. The tests couldn't see whether the youngster was in rags or in tweeds, and they couldn't hear the accents of the slums. The tests revealed intellectual gifts at every level of the population.

......Whatever their faults, the tests have proven fairer and more reliable than any other method when they are used cautiously within the limits for which they were designed.****

In conclusion, the economist has learned much from the educators, psychologists and sociologist concerning quality and equality in education. No one could leave these meetings without a feeling of guilt at the inequities and the deficiencies of our educational system. But the economist is confronted with limited resources and institutional barriers to mobilizing these resources for education. The participants, as a rule tended to minimize the economic problems and either argued that the mobilization of dollars was a problem of secondary importance or that enough resources could be mobilized to deal with the problems of low standards, discrimination against the poor, especially racial minorities, the eradication of poverty (in part through improved education for minorities), and the costs of automation. I have tried to show that the problems of finance are serious indeed and choices will have to be made among numerous welfare programs including education, and within education, among general improvements of standards, gains for the disadvantaged minorities, raising the standards of the states with low outlays per student, and between lower and higher education. It is the task of the educators, psychologists and sociologists to identify the non-economic educational problems; the economists must measure the costs involved in dollars and real resources, and consider the difficulties of obtaining these necessary resources.

---

* Economic Report of the President, 1964, p97.
** Ibid, pp94-95.
*** See especially Admission to Harvard College, A Report by the Special Committee on College Admission Policy, 1960, pp19-25.
****J. W. Gardner, Excellence, New York, Harper & Bros., 1961, pp48-49.

THE SOCIAL COSTS OF QUALITY AND EQUALITY IN EDUCATION

Robin M. Williams, Jr.
Cornell University

I. Introduction

Social change in education, as elsewhere, often begins with discontent. This Conference has unveiled an impressive variety of discontents concerning the present condition of education in the United States. The stage of social action is most likely to come when to this disaffection with the status quo ante (based on the gap between performance and aspirations) is added a sense of realistic hope. The next steps, then, are likely to come as ways are found to hold out rewards to individuals and organizations for innovations intended to reduce the causes of our discomfort. In the educational enterprise, changes in policies and new social organizations and procedures are produced by an endless cycle of alienation-and-response by colleges and universities, schools of education, superintendents, publishers, teachers, state departments of education, the Congress, state legislatures, local school boards, parents' organizations, teachers' organizations, and so on and on. In education, as elsewhere, social problems have no "final solution"; instead there is only the possibility that the "problem" is transformed by copying behavior, and the society then moves on to focus upon some other problematic situation.

"Education" as the total process of learning and teaching is coextensive with social life. Everything a person experiences that alters his mind and character is, in the larger sense, part of the education of the human organism--an entity that is in some ways so remarkably docile in the face of the recalcitrance of its environment and in other ways itself so very recalcitrant. From Plato on, it has been recognized periodically that the shaping of the adult social individual is the outcome of the total sociocultural matrix in which he lives. So in this broadest and most fundamental sense, American education is the sum total of all the influences playing upon individuals from the whole environing culture and social system: ". . . all of life educates, and . . . deliberate education represents only one small part of the total education of the child."[1]

Education in modern societies, however, increasingly is carried on by a differentiated, separate, specialized set of institutions. This means, in the first place, that special norms guide conduct and define social positions within the educational sector. Second, as sets of interconnected behaviors, educational processes constitute a partial social system, a subsystem of the total society. Therefore, the educational sector is partially autonomous, and at the same time partially interdependent with all of the other major institutional subsystems.[2]

---

[1] Lawrence A. Cremin: "The Education of the Public," Harvard Graduate School of Education Bulletin , Vol. IX, No. 3, Fall, 1964, p. 3.

[2] Sloan R. Wayland: "Structural features of American education as basic factors in innovation," in Matthew B. Miles (ed.): Innovation in Education, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, N. Y., 1964, pp. 587-613.

In our society, the schools are expected: (1) to train the organism (to develop skills, physical fitness, and "disciplines"--such as sitting quietly for hours each day); (2) to transmit the received culture to the endless "daily invasion of young barbarians"; (3) to equip the individual, at least minimally, to perform his roles as worker and citizen; (4) to provide a setting for personality development and general social maturation; (5) to keep youths out of the labor market and off the streets. Among these broad rubrics of objectives, it happens that the parents and taxpayers of America have at one time or another demanded that the schools undertake almost every imaginable kind of instruction, indoctrination, guidance, surveillance, and custodial care.[3]

It seems reasonably plain, upon any close inspection, that educational organizations and systems in the United States are often charged with tasks that they cannot perform and loaded with claims that they cannot satisfy. At one time or another, the schools and colleges are asked to solve all major social problems, to counteract the damage created by all other institutional sectors of the national society, and to cure, largely by psychological means, social ills that can only be treated effectively by major economic and political actions.

Is chronic unemployment rising among urban youths? Let the school prepare youngsters for life. Do Negro children suffer from the effects of deprivation? Have the schools repair the damage. Does juvenile delinquency inevitably arise in our Racketsvilles, Slumtowns, and Haulburgs?[4] To the rescue with special schools. Does patriotism flag, or depressions threaten, or international affairs go awry? Why aren't the schools and the colleges doing their job?

The United States has pioneered in compulsory, publicly-supported mass education, carried out under a highly decentralized system of financial support and organization. Today it educates a large proportion of its young people to higher levels than any other nation.[5] However, the years since World War II have brought a world-wide rise in expectations and demands relating to education. Increasingly, everywhere, social salvation is sought in industrial development, and education increasingly is seen as a chief instrumentality for attaining the alleged blessings of urban industrialism.

---

[3] Cf. Vivian Row Thayer: The Role of the School in American Society, Dodd, Mead & Company, New York, Chapter 1.

[4] Irving Spergel: Racketville, Slumtown, Haulburg: An Exploratory Study of Delinquent Subcultures, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1964.

[5] Seymour Martin Lipset: "The Value Patterns of Democracy: A Case Study in Comparative Analysis," American Sociological Review, Vol. 28, No. 4, August, 1963, p. 524. Cf. Frank Bowles: Access to Higher Education, Vol. I, UNESCO and the International Association of Universities, Paris, 1963, pp. 138-139. "In the United States there has been regular growth within a well-established educational system which is almost unique in the world in its assignment of all the functions of higher education to colleges and universities." (Page 139).

Whatever the present expectations and future hopes may be in the American case, they involve a system of formal education of unprecedented size, scope, and complexity. Let us remind ourselves of its size: over 2 million teachers, more than 50 million students, an investment of over $30 billion. It involves the working time of over one-third of all Americans each school day. An enterprise of this magnitude requires some $40 billion a year, as of the early 1960's, amounting to about 5 per cent of the Gross National Product.[6] This gigantic system operates in a climate of urgency and accelerated change.[7] Rapidly mounting demands for higher quality education for a larger and larger proportion of the population at advanced levels have coincided with the struggle for racial desegregation and with insistent demands for widening of opportunity for upward social mobility for the more severely disadvantaged elements of the population. It is in this complex and challenging setting that we now examine the problems of quality and equality.

II. The Terms of Discourse

First we must clarify the main terms used to identify our subject.

What does "equality" mean? As Martin A. Trow has suggested, there are "strong" and "weak" meanings. Equality of opportunity may mean simply that there are no legal or formal barriers to access to the educational system at all levels. But such "equality" may be nearly meaningless if low incomes and deprivational environments prevent most persons from utilizing the nominal opportunities. A somewhat stronger concept of equality would call for equality in actual accessibility, e.g., through provision of bus transportation, free books, lunches, scholarships, and so on. This approach would still leave untouched the disadvantages affecting children from families and neighborhoods that do not instill adequate self-conceptions,[8] aspirations, motivation, and background knowledge. The strongest concept of equality of opportunity would envision attempts to provide substantive equality of socio-cultural environments in all respects, e.g., as in nursery schools, home-enrichment programs, or individual tutoring of pre-school children. At the extreme, of course, absolute literal equality would mean removal of children from the family.

As Natalie Rogoff has put it, in an alternative formulation, the idea of equality of opportunity may be expressed in a "radical", a "moderate", or a "conservative" pattern. In the most clear-cut ("radical") formulation, persons of equal ability would always be able to reach equal levels of the educational system, and persons of higher ability would always go on to higher levels than persons of lower ability. In the "moderate" pattern, the rate of movement into higher levels would be more highly affected by ability than by social origin, but social origin (or group membership) still would substantially facilitate or retard the attainments of pupils at each level of ability. In the most "conservative" pattern, the pupils' social origins (race, class, etc.) would determine educational attainment, regardless of ability: "The pattern of opportunity would show no sensitivity to ability but would decrease at successively less favorable class positions."[9]

---

[6] Fritz Machlup computes the real cost of all forms of education in the United States as of 1958 at $60.2 billion, as over against $33.3 for elementary and secondary schooling. (The Production and Distribution of Knowledge in the United States, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1962.)

[7] Cf. Matthew B. Miles (ed.), Innovation in Education, op. cit., pp. 8-10.

[8] See Morris Rosenberg: Society and the Adolescent Self-Image, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1965.

As the discussions of this Conference have shown, the actual application of the notions of "equality of opportunity" or "equality of concern" (Sidney Hook) is a highly subtle affair. This is true, for one thing, because of the great variations among individuals in capabilities and performances across a complex profile of qualitatively disparate potentialities. Accordingly, there is not simple "quantitative" equality in which a single standard mode of treatment would be equally satisfactory for all individuals in all their variegated modes of functioning. How does one treat "equally" a child who is slow in mathematics, facile verbally, socially poised and sensitive, impulsive, generous, and poor in gymnastics--as over against a child with the opposite profile? It seems that the only practicable answer is to provide a common minimum of exposure to standard opportunities, plus great sensitivity and skillful handling by teachers of each individual's special traits and capacities.

It is perhaps testimony to the progress that has been achieved in many parts of the American school system toward formal equality that we now have turned increased attention to the inequalities derived from racial segregation, differences in socio-economic position of families, geographic location and mobility, possible biases of teachers, possible biases in testing and the like. As we achieve greater equality in the grosser conditions, the remaining inequalities stand out more clearly; in this sense we agree with Thayer that "The Road to Equality Hath No Ending."[10]

The members of this Conference seemed to share a belief in the desirability of wide opportunity for talent and a belief in the undesirability of ethnocentric, educationally irrelevant discrimination and segregation. There was further substantial, although not unanimous, agreement upon the importance of (a) differences among individuals, (b) differences among various abilities and other characteristics of the same individual. Several of the Conference participants stressed the idea that equality of opportunity, therefore, might mean non-identity of treatment and that it should imply the right of individual children to be different. A recurrent theme was the tension between standardized treatment and the variety of potentialities (intellectual, emotional, social, aesthetic, etc.) of individuals.[11] This tension perhaps was most sharply formulated when assertions that "the whole person must be educated" were met by a critical rejection of totalistic school pressures upon the child (Friedenberg).

---

[9] Natalie Rogoff: "American Public Schools and Equality of Opportunity," in A. H. Halsey, Jean Floud, and C. Arnold Anderson (eds.): Education, Economy and Society, The Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1964, p. 145.

[10] op. cit., pp. 71-72.

[11] "When we examine the effects of segregation by ability we find it most difficult to strike a balance; the least capable may benefit by freedom from competitive pressure, but they also lose stimulation by isolation from more widely accepted standards of competence." (C. Arnold Anderson and Philip J. Foster: "Discimination and Inequality in Education," Sociology of Education, Vol. 38, No. 1, Fall, 1964, p. 14.)

Under an educational system that--although increasingly centralized and standardized--is still marked by an impressive degree of local autonomy, substantial inequalities persist even in the gross accessibility of opportunity. There are marked differences on regional and state bases, and between central cities and suburbs and rural districts. It is true, of course, that many of these differences are not the results of deliberate discrimination, but reflect complex historical processes of unplanned development. Furthermore, it is not legitimate to infer discrimination from the sheer fact of imparities in educational attainment among various segments of the population--e.g., girls and boys, rural vs. urban areas, regions, religious groupings, racial categories. As Anderson and Foster convincingly show, ". . . 'discrimination' refers to a bewildering melange of situations with vastly different origins and consequences."[12] Nevertheless, it is clear that minimum equality of opportunity would require massive efforts to break down racial discrimination, to improve the poorer schools, to enrich community and home environments, and to provide job opportunities for the product of the schools.

Implicit in much of the Conference discussion (and most strongly expressed in the paper by Harold Taylor) was rejection of the educational policy that would produce an Elite sharply separated intellectually and socially from the remainder of the population in this country. Detailed consensus on the meaning of "quality", however, was not obvious. It was apparent that a "Jeffersonian" emphasis on high level training of the intellectually gifted could produce "elitism" unless skillfully integrated with a common-content program and with differentiated treatment adapted to within-individual and across-individuals differences. Not discussed, but clearly important, was the fact that "quality" can only be developed, or appraised, relative to a particular kind of ability or trait.

"Ability" is not a single, clear, generalized, unitary phenomenon; instead there is a complex profile of many qualitatively non-comparable capacities and performances. To say, therefore, that we are going to provide equal opportunity for everyone to develop his "full potential" is to give a very questionable statement. All potentialities? All to the same degree? If this is what is meant, perhaps the stated objective is literally impossible to achieve. To achieve maximum artistic sensitivity may not be fully compatible with the development of greatest emotional stability. To become a top-flight engineer may not be fully congruent with a well-rounded education in depth in so-called humanistic studies. And so on indefinitely.

Clearly, there are many circumstances under which "equality" and "quality" are in competition for scarce educational resources. Recognition of this allocative problem raises crucial questions of specific educational policies. Should there be homogenous groupings by ability? If so, how early? Should selection of different educational "tracks" or "streams" be made early or late? How selective should various types of higher education be? How--that is, by what means--should selection be made? Should special efforts be made to raise I.Q.'s of children from culturally deprived backgrounds? Questions of these kinds inevitably raise the general problem of "cost"--and the more specific question of the meaning of "social costs".

---

[12] "Discrimination and Inequality in Education," op. cit., p. 28.

What could be meant by "social costs"-- that presumably are not adequately reflected in "monetary costs", e.g., as a proportion of the society's total resources or income that is required to give equality of high quality education? Presumably the economic costs adequately represent the allocation of capital, land, labor and entrepreneurial and organizational resources devoted to education. What is left?

To speak of a "social cost" is to refer to a value-judgment. Without the application of given standards of evaluation, it is impossible to say what social conditions or processes constitute "costs" rather than "gains". Therefore, discourse on the topic requires initial value-assumptions. The assumptions we set up here are regarded only as heuristic, for the purposes at hand.

"Social costs", therefore, must mean consequences that someone evaluates negatively, relative to alternative outcomes. We might pose the issue in this way: What are some important social conditions that thoughtful, informed and reasonable men often have regarded as undesirable, relatively apart from their own special interests or self-pleading? A list of such conditions that probably would win substantial assent would perhaps include the following:

1. "Needless" destruction of human life.
2. "Needless" destruction or loss of physical health and bodily integrity.
3. "Needless" production of psychoses and disabling neuroses; destruction of self-esteem and hope.
4. Destruction or loss of production of valued goods and services.
5. Mis-use of talent, e.g. failure to utilize at all; utilization in under-demanding or over-demanding activities.
6. Production of marked ideological distortions of reality.
7. Generation of needlessly disruptive cleavages within the society.
8. Encouragement or facilitation of the inflicting of unnecessary suffering on persons.
9. Marked lowering of social predictability, sufficient to downgrade the attainment of a wide range of values for substantial numbers and proportions of the population.
10. Substantial weakening of the national society's capacity for competitive survival.
11. Failure of challenge to individuals to use their capacities for productive work, skilled performance, social participation, integrated affective expression, intellectual accomplishment, aesthetic creation and appreciation.

Undoubtedly other items could be added. It is recognized also that not all of these just mentioned will win universal acceptance, even given charitable interpretation of such question-begging terms as "needlessly". Perhaps the intended meanings of some of the items may be clarified by a few further illustrations.

We assume for purposes of present discussion, that it is a social cost if highly talented and trained people are prevented from using their abilities or if poorly qualified persons are used at tasks beyong thier capacities of efficient performance.

We assume that the use of coercion is a social cost, even if some coercion is unavoidable.

It is further assumed that social costs are represented by inefficient and distorted communication among individuals and collectivities, with attendant ambiguities and misunderstandings.

We assume that mass frustrations, arising from a gap between socially legitimized aspirations and available legitimate opportunities represent social costs.

Conditions that evoke chronic rage among large numbers of people are here considered to be socially costly.

The same is true of social conditions leading to chronic fear.

It is socially costly if social and cultural conditions internal to a social system reduce its capacity to adapt to its physical environment.

The same holds for a reduction in capacity to adapt to and cope with external threats--political, military, economic, cultural--from other social systems.

Conditions associated with high levels of guilt and shame among a substantial proportion of the population are here regarded costly.

Social costs are represented by socially-induced psychological conditions that result in incapacities of performance--e.g., chronic alcoholism, psychoses, psychosomatic illness, absenteeism, "accident-proneness".

Some degree of social cost is incurred by anomic states that bring about unpredictability, confusion, or excessive discontinuity in social roles and relationships--e.g., as represented in migration, divorce, unemployment, abrupt and unwanted retirement, disagreement on norms of conduct, confusion of beliefs.

With regard to the specific case of racial segregation that results in low-quality education for minority racial categories, we believe that there is considerable evidence that such segregation leads to:

1. Lack of utilization of high talent.

2. Poor performance, both by reason of:
    (a) psychological disturbance; and
    (b) deficiencies in skill and knowledge.

3. Mass frustration.

4. White persons' "guilt".

5. Negro persons' "shame" (low self-esteem), and consequent rage and fear.

6. Discrepancies of norms, values, and beliefs between segregated segments (although separation may, to some extent, increase intra-segment consensus).

7. Decrease in capacity for full and clear communication.

8. Decrease in inter-segment capacity for coordinated behavior.

It is evident, then, that economic costs need not be identical with social costs. Thus, under the outrageous assumption that the average white man's welfare would be weighted as twice that of the Negro's, one could imagine an educational system that "economically" and "efficiently" produced caste-typed training for two separate segments of the population--with police control and armed power maintaining a repressive political system. Such a system might even be politically viable over a long period of time, although highly costly in terms of certain other standards of value.

Since we assume here that liberal and humane objectives will represent much of the thrust of American education in the immediate future, our appraisal of social costs will not explicitly consider further the various conceivable radically different frameworks for evaluation.

III. The Context: Education in American Society

What is the educational setting within which we must assess social benefits and costs?

As in all societies, formal education in the United States has the three primary tasks of socialization, discovery of knowledge and selection--of training and transforming its student members, of exploring the world, and of selecting some students at each major stage to go on to higher and/or specialized training. On the whole the total system overwhelmingly has taken the Jacksonian rather than the Jeffersonian option--of attempting to spread opportunity for relatively advanced training widely throughout the population rather than concentrating it upon a highly selected stratum of the most able.[13] It is predominantly (85 per cent) a tax-supported, compulsory system at the elementary and secondary levels. Increasingly higher education is also publicly supported. Although local financial support and local autonomy historically were dominant, a number of important influences have moulded a congeries of local units into an, effectively, national system.

---

[13] "Currently about two-thirds of all young people earn a high school diploma and about half of these graduates enter college." (Eli Ginzberg and John L. Herma, et. al.: Talent and Performance, Columbia University Press, New York, 1964, p. 3.)

In all our present discussion we are talking about a national society increasingly geared to continuous complex technological and organizational innovation, systematically sought in the service of economic enterprise, military preparedness, and the welfare state. We are talking about a society that has begun to think of education as capital formation--and Professor T. W. Schulter estimates that human capital as a percentage of all productive capital rose from 22 to 42 between 1950 and 1957.[14]

Evidences of increased centralism abound. The number of school districts in 1959-1960 was 40,500; in 1963, it was 31,700--a decrease of 22 per cent in four year.[15] The share of total appropriation for public schools furnished by states, rather than by localities, was 16.5 per cent in 1919-1920 and 39.1 in 1959-1960.[16] Nevertheless, observers of American education by common consent acknowledge its diversity in different schools, localities, states, and regions. On all the generally used statistical criteria, the picture is one of increased professionalization on the one hand, and increased bureaucratic centralization on the other. Schools are larger; districts are larger; teacher training levels rise year by year; more and more specialists are at work. There is continually greater use of standardized tests. Standards of instruction and performance increasingly emanate from state and national organizations. Decisions concerning the actual content of instruction are being made, more and more insistently, at the state level. Reliance grows upon (formal, bureaucratic) organization and procedures--administrative hierarchies, explicit rules, fixed tests, standard operating procedures, mechanized and computerized systems of keeping records, and--just over the horizon--of teaching as well. Meanwhile the centralization of school districts and the increased size of school units tend to increase the social and cultural heterogeneity of the school populations. Administrative inclinations toward simplicity, clarity, definiteness, and "rigidity" are not lessened by the attendant problems of just maintaining an operating system. One thus knows whereof Goslin speaks when he refers to ". . . the problems faced by administrators and teachers who are responsible for providing public education in areas where the response to economic and social frustration has been a rising tide of aggression, mistrust and lack of respect for authority."[17]

It seems clear, as Friedenberg reminds us, ". . . that the historically decisive reason for the maintenance of the public schools has been to prepare youngsters, and especially poor youngsters, to hold jobs that would give them a higher standard of living and perhaps even a better life."[18] Friedenberg accepts this role for the school, but he wants vocational preparation to stop short of "turning the 'culturally deprived' into petits bourgeois," through taking advantage of the helplessness of these "disfranchised conscripts within its compulsory school system." The selecting and allocating functions lead to high social visibility and to potentially vital political implications. In a passage of some compactness Goslin points out several facets of this situation:

---

[14] Cf. Halsey, et. al., op. cit., p. 3 and chapter 6.

[15] David A. Goslin: The School in Contemporary Society, Scott, Foresman and Company, Chicago, 1965, p. 48.

[16] Ibid, p. 40.

[17] Ibid, p. 96.

[18] Friedenberg, E. Z.: "The Content and Processes of Education", p. 21 (present report)

> With the rise of mass education the school functions as an integral part of the process of status allocation in four ways: (1) by providing a context in which the individual can demonstrate his ability, (2) by channeling individuals into paths that lead in the direction of different occupations or classes of occupations, (3) by providing the particular skills needed to fulfill the requirements of various positions, and finally (4) by transferring to the individual the differential prestige of the school itself.[19]

Educational achievement by the pupil within the school is, of course, a complex social process, composed of long sequences of events that affect the pupil's motivation, skill, knowledge, aspirations, and self-conceptions. Inputs into this process come first from the family, in two forms: (1) specific encouragements and discouragements, rewards and punishments for particular aspirations, and performances in the school; (2) basic personality disciplines and dispositions affecting performance, such asaggressiveness, ability to work for deferred gratifications, or need for adult approval. Second, the teachers and other school personnel reward and punish particular performances, and encourage or discourage various aspirations and self-conceptions. Third, the peer groupings in the school and outside of it may likewise powerfully influence the individual child. Fourth, all of these "micro" processes may be affected by the "macro" characteristics of the school and then of the environing community. Thus, a community predominately composed of working-class families may give the schools only moderate financial support and may set low expectations for pupils, and develop norms of low academic performance. There is substantial evidence that the "macro" or ecological setting does affect rates of educational achievement.[20]

Assuming that endemic international conflicts do not increasingly negate rising domestic productivity, and assuming in addition that nuclear war does not occur, it is to be expected that an increasing proportion of the labor force will be active in the ultimate occupations--those that directly minister to the health, recreation, education, comfort, and expressive capacities of the people. For the most part, these are and will be professional, semi-professional, and technical occupations--that is, occupations that require complex knowledge, generally high mastery of specific techniques, considerable responsibility for a "patient" or a "client", and capacities for personal relationships that are often delicate in emotional balance and sensitive to moral nuances. Thus, the education task further grows in complexity.

It has never been easy to choose and shape the infinitely varied and subtly recalcitrant and creative materials represented by the streams of new humans entering the schools. Not even standardized tests and national norms can give us the illusion that the task grows any easier in these days or will do so in the years ahead.

---

[19] The School in Contemporary Society, op. cit., p. 9.

[20] James S. Coleman: The Adolescent Society, The Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1961; Natalie Rogoff in Halsey, et. al., op. cit., pp. 241-250.

How shall "ability" be determined? The possible criteria certainly include the following, among others:

1. Grades on standardized competitive examinations, uniform over a school system, state, region, or the entire nation, and purporting to index academic achievement.
2. Grades on examinations constructed and marked by individual teachers, at their own discretion.
3. Various types of tests designed to index "intelligence", "educability", and the like.
4. Ratings by teachers.
5. Recommendations of parents and/or other local laymen ("sponsorship").
6. Socio-economic position of family of origin.

Who is least likely to go to college? It is very clear from numerous studies that those least likely to go to college are the students who come from families of low income; from the racial or ethnic groupings of Negroes, French Canadians, Orientals, and Spanish-speaking immigrants; from Southern states; from farmer or manual worker backgrounds.[21]

Why do children from different social origins differ in educational attainment? First, they might differ in innate, generalized potential for achievement. Second, they might be selectively rewarded and punished in the classroom. Third, their family background might have resulted in motivation, values, and early skills and knowledge that determine the trajectory of academic achievement. Fourth, the community setting of the school and the family may affect educational facilities as well as reinforce a pervasive climate of expectation and aspirations, and corresponding social sanctions that strongly affect performance.[22] Actually Rogoff's analysis of nation-wide data suggests that scholastic ability and socio-economic status of families are associated in about equal measure with desires and plans to attend college. As Harbison and Myers point out, the efficient development of "human resources" requires not only formal education, but also the provision of suitable incentives for persons to secure education, as well as a variety of types of on-the-job training.[23]

---

[21] Cf. Dael Wolfle: "Educational Opportunity, Measured Intelligence, and Social Background," in A. H. Halsey, _et. al._ (eds.): _op. cit._, p. 229.

[22] The last three points are taken from Natalie Rogoff: "Local Social Structure and Educational Selection," in Halsey, _et. al._ (eds.): _op. cit._, pp. 243-244.

[23] Frederick Harbison and Charles A. Myers: _Education, Manpower and Economic Growth_, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1964.

Without entering at this point into the usual plea for additional research, it seems plain from our present knowledge that careful study will reveal numerous variations in equality of opportunity and in the qualities of education even within superficially similar educational environments.[24]

IV. Education and Social Mobility: Some Acclaimed and Some Unacclaimed Consequences

In his State of the Union message on January 4, 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson urged that the nation act to insure to every American child the fullest development of his mind and spirit. Undoubtedly implicit in that statement is an appeal to the powerful conviction among the American people that education can liberate individuals and families from the constrictions of economic position and social rank below their levels of aspiration. So long has upward social moblility been applauded and encouraged in our society that only rarely is its desirability questioned, and only rarely is public attention focused upon the very considerable amount of downward mobility that occurs in a highly competitive open-class society continuously undergoing rapid technological and economic change. The American Dream in this area of life might be called Achievement Unlimited, and its social costs seldom are identified or appraised.

But as Melvin Tumin has pointed out, not all the results and accompaniments of high social mobility would be acclaimed as desirable were they clearly understood. Certainly it has long been apparent to insightful social critics that not all the consequences of high rates of social mobility are to be regarded as positive values for the individuals and collectivities thereby affected.[25] High upward "contest" mobility[26] by means of open competition leads to high rates of downward mobility if the birth rates of upper strata are large enough to fill all the contested positions. To the extent that downward mobility is depriving, frustrating, humiliating, or otherwise hurtful, this must be accounted a social cost. On the same side of the scales, the psychological wounds incurred by the upwardly mobile--by reason of envy, insecurity, guilt, separation-anxieties, and the like--are intrinsically costly, and their further consequences in neurosis, aggression, or social withdrawal may likewise qualify as detrimental in terms of certain standards of evaluation.

In the nature of the case, high upward mobility must imply intensive competition, unless opportunities expand at such a rapid rate as to outrun mass aspirations. Intensive competition may bring, and does bring, great satisfaction to many energetic and competent people. It also, however, frequently entails sever strains in the form of feelings of insecurity, anxiety, constriction of experience, and interpersonal distrust and hostility. The concentration of attention, affect, and activity often required for successful competition may encroach upon and blot out whole areas of family life, aesthetic experience, moral sensitivities, and satisfying social communication. Thus some contemporary critics have suggested that there is a genuine question of values as to whether in the future our society can afford ". . . that loss of self-respect engendered by measuring human worth on a scale of occupational achievement."[27]

---

[24] Many observers have commented on this point. Cf. James B. Conant: The Education Of American Teachers, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1963, especially Chapters 2 and 3.

[25] Melvin Tumin: "Some Disfunctions of Institutional Imbalances," Behavioral Science, Vol. 1, July, 1956, pp. 218-233.

[26] Ralph H. Turner: "Sponsored and Contest Mobility and the School System," American Sociological Review, Vol. 25, No. 6, December, 1960, pp. 855-867.

Completely open access to formal educational opportunity, plus various kinds of early remedial action to offset at least part of the effects of environmental deprivation, undoubtedly can increase the possibilities for successful competition on the part of children and youths from "underprivileged" backgrounds. To the extent that this equalization of advantage actually occurs, of course, the general incidence of competition is increased, and members of previously dominant groups and classes may find their established positions threatened.

It is likely that the correlation between educational level attained and social mobility will be the less . . .:

(a) . . . the less variation there is in the type and quality of education offered to various segments of the population;

(b) . . . the larger the proportion of children enrolled in schools and the longer they are retained in school;

(c) . . . the more capable the occupants of higher social positions;

(d) . . . the higher the birth rate of the occupants of higher social positions;

(e) . . . the slower the relative growth of high-income, high-prestige occupations;

(f) . . . the less selective the grading and promotion schemes within the schools in advancing pupils to higher educational levels;

(g) . . . the less the correlation between academic grading and "native" ability, i. e. the less valid the testing;

(h) . . . the less the relevance to job-permanence of the educational content and test-measurement found in the schools.

It is generally taken as self-evident that an intensification of search for "talent", extending into earlier and earlier years of the life-career represents an intensification of competitive demands and pressures upon individual pupils (even at early elementary or kindergarten levels). What may not be so immediately obvious is that this same search for talent accentuates competition among teachers, schools, and school systems--for the professional educator tends to be judged by the "productivity" of the educational unit which with he or she is associated. In turn, the tendency for schools to be drawn into a state-wide, region-wide or even nation-wide contest for the production of "successful talent" leads to further consequences for the individual students. It has been suggested that some individuals in the successful struggle to rise to the top develop a pattern of forming instrumental, "useful" personal relationships and then discarding them--a pattern that may result in an eventual incapacity to form genuine relations of trust and friendship.[28] We are very far from having sufficient research evidence to make any comprehensive appraisal of the effects on personalities and on social values of social mobility. In an interesting monograph, Turner has suggested that many persons emphasize eminence within a particular occupation or occupational category rather than interstratum or interclass mobility.[29] To the extent that good performance comes to be valued, regardless of occupation, the strains of the present system may be reduced.

---

[27] Basil Bernstein: "Social Class and Linguistic Development: A Theory of Social Learning," in A. H. Halsey, et. al., op. cit., p. 310.

Under the persuasive sway of the conception of Achievement Unlimited, some contemporary writers on educational opportunity appear to have convinced themselves that technological change is about to produce an occupational structure in which normal work has vanished and all jobs represent highly trained performance of complex functions--prestigeful, clean, well-paid, and interesting. Surely the idea that manual work will almost or completely disappear in the near future is a utopian notion, abetted by romantic conceptions of the awesome powers of computers and "automation". Not everyone in the economy of our foreseeable future can be "professionalized".[30] The semi-skilled and service occupations will continue to employ substantial numbers of persons for a long time to come--even if the United States continues to enjoy prosperity and a measure of peace in an uncertain world. This being the case, one must ask what will be the social and psychological consequences of present educational practices upon the minority of youths who must end up in the bottom ranks of the occupational hierarchy. It seems likely that their sense of failure would be all the sharper for knowing that they are in a small minority and from the implication that their position is not due to discrimination but to personal failure in performance.[31] To the extent that competitive pressures increase, we may find increased rather than lessened withdrawal from the race, as a reaction to strain where the stakes are seen as too high and the struggle too demanding.[32]

Further, not everyone will be happy over some of the other by-products of accelerated upward mobility. The pressure of larger and larger numbers of mobility-oriented youths in the colleges and universities is likely to add to the already strong emphasis upon vocationalism. Many observers share Clark's concern that a society in which, already, more than one-half of all first-degree graduates come from schools of business administration, education, and engineering may create a leadership of "experts" whose training has been lacking in basic understanding of the humanities and the social sciences.[33] At the extreme, the "expert society" would be a society of "technical barbarism" among much of its crucial leadership, as well as its great middle-class sector. To this problem we shall return.

---

[28] W. Lloyd Warner and James C. Abegglen: Big Business Leaders in America, Harper, New York, 1955.

[29] Ralph H. Turner: The Social Context of Ambition: A Study of High School Seniors in Los Angelos, Chandler Publishing Company, San Francisco, 1964.

[30] See Harold L. Wilensky: "The Professionalization of Everyone?" The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXX, No. 2, September, 1964, pp. 137-158.

[31] "Situations of opportunity are also situations of denial and failure. Thus democratic societies need not only to motivate achievement but also to mollify those denied it in order to sustain motivation in the face of disappointment and to deflect resentment." (Burton R. Clark: "The 'Cooling-out' Function in Higher Education," in A. H. Halsey, et. al., op. cit., p. 513.

[32] An hypothesis advanced by Talcott Parsons: "The School Class as a Social System: Some of Its Functions in American Society," in A. H. Halsey, et. al., op. cit., pp. 447-448.

To these considerations we must add acknowledgment of the relevance of Friedenberg's indictment of the "bureaucratization of adolescence" in schools, especially against an avowedly well-intentioned but totalistic "invasion of privacy" and "normative direction of conduct." He counts it an unacceptable cost that the schools in their efforts to foster good citizenship, adjustment, and success may crush out genuine individuality.[34]

Thus, we are suggesting the need for second thoughts on an American Dream.

V. "Wastes" and "Frictions" in Contemporary Education

Many of the consequences just described would seem fanciful to many teachers and administrators who are struggling from day to day with the impediments to achievement that are continuously being generated both within the schools and in their environing social settings. It would be redundant here to describe all the phenomena, explored in other papers at this Conference, of the lost talent, the misplaced merit, the compulsory mediocracy, the unchallenged creativity, and the alienated rejects of our schools.[35]

The enormous rates of drop-outs and of retarded achievement in low-income population have highlighted the inability of the formally organized educational system to cope with the problems of motivation, conceptual lacks, emotional controls, and deficiencies in social skills generated in family and community. This massive "failure" shows clearly how much of the influence of the family and community has been taken for granted in the schools, usual approach to middle-class children. Approaches and techniques that seemed quite naturally successful with the products of middle-class families often fall short when applied to some of the children from many low-income,

---

[33] Burton R. Clark: Educating the Expert Society, Chandler Publishing Company, San Francisco, 1962.

[34] (Cross-reference to chapter by Friedenberg).

[35] We concur in the judgment that to a considerable extent ". . . the ordinary operation of educational institutions, quite apart from deliberately discriminatory measures, tends to cut down the amount of mobility opportunity the schools provide." (Howard S. Becker: "Schools and Systems of Stratification," in Halsey, et. al., op. cit., p. 103.)

"broken", matricentric families in neighborhoods of poverty and alienation.[36]

The seriousness of this wastage is accentuated by the fact that life-careers tend to be cumulative. As Ginzberg and Herma say: "The explanation of this tendency toward cumulation lies in the mutual reinforcement of the objective and the subjective. A favorable objective situation makes it easier for an individual to realize his more ambitious goals and as he begins to realize them he finds himself in a better objective condition to continue to do so. The success he has experienced adds to his confidence and conviction that he is heading in the right direction."[37]

It seemed that within this Conference there was general agreement with Judson Shaplin's point that the drop-outs (or "cast-offs") of the present secondary school system have become intractable to usual educational procedures by, say, age 16; these youths apparently require intensive one-to-one teaching control, or therapy if they are to change their patterns of behavior. Given the lack of employment opportunities (or, even, access to military service) for youths in this category, the need for new agencies or programs for this out-of-school population seems generally granted.

Further, in line with the realistic reminders brought to this conference out of the experience of Clarence Senior, we must keep in view that teachers sometimes do not like the children they are supposed to teach, are afraid of them, believe "they can't be taught",--and in their insecurity, fear, and hostility tend to stereotype "the slum child" as a lost cause. Whenever such reactions occur--understandable as they may be--among teachers and other school officials they obviously constitute self-fulfilling prophecies that are self-evidently "validated" by the consequences they help to produce.

Then, there is the problem of how to deal with adequate sensitivity to the needs for freedom, guidance, discipline, and expressive regression of each unique child or youth in an educational system that is increasingly bureaucratic, politicized, harassed, and simply overcrowded. There are numerous organizational frictions in such an enterprise--censorship of books and libraries, political surveillance of teachers, ethnic and religious rivalries, conflicts of teacher organizations and administrative bodies, sabotage of appointments, violent interference from various parent and taxpayers organizations, and continuous sniping from all stand-pat elements of any community.

In many instances major urban school systems are being asked to rectify long-standing and massive situations of segregation and educational inequity of such proportions that any action within the immediate control of the Board of Education would necessarily be regarded as inadequate by ideal standards of integration and equity (e.g., New York City). In other instances, city school boards blindly assert their legal perogatives, in the face of equally intractable and objectionable segregation and inequality, by citing the care-worn slogan of "neighborhood schools" (e.g.,Chicago). Obviously, the hemmed-in racial "ghettos"(created by real-estate dealers, landlords, and the diffuse prejudice of the "majority" population) are not going to dissolve automatically or easily. Decisive public action on a scale not yet seriously contemplated by responsible authorities would be necessary. Perhaps something on the scale of a moon-doogle for each really large city would be all that could be done by legal and fiscal instrumentalities: After all, the six largest cities, charged at $30 billion each, would be only $180 billion.

---

[37] Ginzberg and Herma, op. cit., p. 216.

To develop intra-urban "towns" that would present to the schools an interesting, stimulative, and practically manageable assemblage of our essential urban diversity would require an unprecedented, imaginative series of political and financial encounters with the often disjointed and ineffective local and state governments. What city government in its plans for urban renewal ("slum-re-location"; "Negro removal") has seriously sought practicable means to bring back middle-income white families into interracial settlements in the central city, built on relatively low-cost land created by clearing obsolescent industrial and commercial areas? We trust examples may be cited in the future.

Thus it is that, North or South, East or West, we find continuing intrenched resistances to the provision of even nominal equality of opportunity.[38]

Where open-door policies do, more-or-less, prevail, the pressures grow for admission of all students to higher and higher levels of the system. At the college and university level, the survivors of the secondary schools demand opportunity. But the institutions of higher education are driven by a variety of considerations to be "selective". The consequence is a conflict of "equality" and "quality" in which ". . . while some students of low promise are successful, for large numbers failure is inevitable and structured. The denial is merely delayed, taking place within the college instead of at the edge of the system."[39]

If the state universities are required to admit all graduates of certified high schools within the state, they may be able to survive their immediate teaching and management problems by inflicting public failure on one-third or more of the entering freshmen. Clark points out that to the interested public this procedure may appear as no less than a heartless slaughter of innocents.

Yet, premature conclusions should be avoided. Eckland has presented these data:

	1950 Vanderbilt students after 7 years (N=595)	1952 Illinois students after 10 years (N=1,180)
	%'s	
Graduates who never dropped	50.8	49.7
Dropouts who later graduated	20.8	19.4
Dropouts who are potential graduates	4.9	5.1
Dropouts whose graduation appears unlikely	23.5	25.8
	100.0	100.0

---

[38] See, for example, Thomas F. Pettigrew: "Continued Barriers to Desegrated Education in the South," Sociology of Education, Vol. 38, No. 2, Winter, 1965, pp. 99-111.

[39] Burton R. Clark: "The 'Cooling-out' Function in Higher Education," in A. H. Halsey, op. cit., p. 515.

He comments that ". . . both studies confirm that a large segment of the students presumed to be lost to higher education, in fact, come back and later attain degrees."[40] There is no necessity for us to underestimate the desire for achievement among American youth.

As American society moves into a future visualized as a Great Society of open-ended opportunities, careful attention must be focused upon the potentially tremendous social and political repercussions of exactly the "democratic opportunity" for which so many liberal educators have longed.

The number of young people "potentially available" for college education in 1970-1980 already is roughly predictable, for the college-age youths of 1980 already have been born. The crucial variables are enrollment and drop-out rates, and these depend upon a large number of variables of unknown magnitudes.[41] The most likely assumptions, however, are that initial enrollments will rise much more rapidly than drop-outs, resulting in a rising per cent of the relevant age groups in college. A recent set of estimates goes as follows:[42]

Year	Population aged 18-21 (millions)	Per cent in college	Estimated enrollment (millions)
1970	14.2	49	6.9
1975	15.8	54	8.6
1980	17.1	60	10.2

If by 1980 college enrollments total some 10.2 millions, representing about 60 per cent of youths aged 18-21--what then? What else happens?

VI. What Price the Great Society?

By now, we trust that the complexity of inventories of "social costs" and "social profits" is sufficiently apparent.

By any contemporary, reasoned and socially-tested standards, the costs of present educational inequities and rigidities are unacceptably high.

But the costs of change are sizeable, and must be weighed in the value-cost balance.

---

[40] Bruce K. Eckland: "A Source of Error in College Attrition Studies," Sociology of Education, Vol. 38, No. 1, Fall, 1964, p. 62.

[41] For some of the difficulties, see Guy H. Orcutt, et. al.: Microanalysis of Socioeconomic Systems: A Simulation Study, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1961, pp. 257-281.

[42] Adapted from "The Flight from Teaching," The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1963-64 Annual Report, p. 3.

As enrollments in higher education cumulate, the proportion of highly trained teachers is likely to decline. As competition accelerates for good teachers and good research workers, universities may find it necessary to utilize "mass-production" techniques, in the interests of minimizing budgets already dourly regarded as astronomical by Boards of Trustees and Legislative Appropriations Committees. Thus, "mere" economic cost is a central issue.

In addition, efforts to provide full equality of opportunity in quality education necessarily confront immediately an impressive set of basic issues and obstacles, including:

1. The question of federal aid and support.
2. The question of separation of Church and State.
3. The questions of freedom and orthodoxy in instruction and learning.
4. The issues of vocational versus general education and of single-track versus multiple-track systems.
5. Political and bureaucratic resistances and sabotage within the educational system.
6. Political and quasi-political resistance and sabotage in the environing social structure.

The great unevenness in financial ability to support education, coupled with the great demand for better and more costly education, has created a growing pressure for state aid to localities and, then, for federal support or aid to states and/or localities. Federal agencies are now spending at least $1.5 billion a year for "education" in one form or another. Especially striking is the role of the Department of Defense, which ". . is supporting more students working full and part-time toward baccalaureate and post-graduate degrees than any other agency. Its expenditures for training under the Government Employees Training Act exceed the amount expended by all other agencies of the Government combined. It operates the largest and almost the only Federal system of elementary and secondary schools--and is responsible for the staffing, the curriculum, and the direction of that system."[46]

As enrollments increase rapidly in higher education in response to the demand for "equality of opportunity", the needed increase in numbers of college teachers seems destined to decrease "quality", as measured by level of training, and by quality of academic performance, and by type of motivation. Also, as Martin Trow puts it: "The rise of vocationalism in American mass higher education is a clear and present danger to the recruitment of really able and creative college teachers."[47] Besides this, everything we know about the influence of social origins indicates that when families of low economic position do begin to want their children to have a college education they think overwhelmingly in terms of specific vocational pay-off. The students from these families are likely to move directly into engineering, agriculture, business administration, or education curricula.

---

[46] Edith Green: "The Federal Role in Education Today," Harvard Graduate School of Education Association, Vol. VIII, No. 1, Spring, 1963, p. 18.

[47] "Recruitment to College Teaching," in Halsey, et. al., op. cit., p. 611.

Because of the growing demand for professional, technical, and managerial occupations, higher education increasingly trains for definite occupational fields. As enrollments expand, a larger proportion of students are oriented to upward mobility through special vocational preparation. The pressure for enrollments leads, at the same time, to disproportionate growth of public colleges and universities--which tend to respond quickly to the demand for job-oriented training. As more students come from low-income backgrounds, a higher proportion will be part-time, and many will be nonresident students.

It seems quite likely, therefore, that the expansion of opportunity for higher education will increase vocationalism.

Another example: integration of Negro and white children in the same school classes initially means at least a short-range increase in competition for the Negro children who come from economically, socially and culturally deprived backgrounds. This is likely to result initially in increased "strain"--more specifically, in increased anxiety, fear, and suppressed resentment, and then, depending on other conditions, these responses may find social expression in processes of distorted communication and conflict.

Parsons has presented a related hypothesis, eminently suitable for testing: "Both the general upgrading process and the pressure to enhanced independence should be expected to increase strain on the lower, most marginal groups. . . As the acceptable minimum of educational qualification rises, persons near and below the margin will tend to be pushed into an attitude of repudiation of these expectations. Truancy and delinquency are ways of expressing this repudiation. Thus the very improvement of educational standards in the society at large may well be a major factor in the failure of the educational process for a growing number at the lower end of the status and ability distribution."[48]

If in the alleged interests of "quality" the schools put to work with so-called homogeneous groupings, they must face the full range of possible consequences, e.g.: ". . . because most currently available measures of ability tend to be correlated with the social class background of the student . . . homogeneous grouping is likely to have the effect of reinforcing social class boundaries within the school and thereby contributing to class crystallization, the degree to which people tend to associate primarily with others in their own social strata."[49]

A hard look, then, at the economic, social and psychological realities of education in our present society throws doubt upon the meaning of the slogan that everyone must be "educated to the limits of his potentials for learning." Taken literally, this objective poses a dilemma in the use of a society's scarce resources. In particular, it raises the question as to what is the optimal use of scarce, highly trained talent in teaching. It would be conceivable to use the full time of several expert "teachers" (including, among others, social workers, nurses, and psychiatrists) with each feebleminded, emotionally disturbed, or physically handicapped child. Undoubtedly there are, at the other extreme, many gifted children who could profit from intensive contact with several expert teachers, on a one-to-one basis. And surely the "potentials" of the average normal child could be much further developed than is typically the case today by an intensive program of stimulation, nurturance, guidance, and individual instruction.

---

[48] In Halsey, et. al., op. cit., p. 448.

[49] Goslin, op. cit., pp. 28-29.

In the actual world of limited resources, institutional rigidities, vested interests, opportunistic ignorance, and several other types of limitations, we may have to anticipate something less than fully satisfactory solutions to the problems we have reviewed.

In short, there are basic limitations upon extremely intensive work with "special" students--with the special problems of students who are culturally deprived, under-motivated, physically handicapped, psychologically disturbed, or who have extremely low and extremely high IQ or especially fast or especially slow rates of learning. Many of these problems are subject to remedy or solution at the present time only through intensive and elaborate procedures used by talented and highly trained persons. The needed personnel are very scarce and the supply can be increased only slowly even with maximum increase in training programs. The dollar costs per pupil are very high, and must be weighed against alternative educational uses of equivalent resources. The benefits to the individual pupils helped likewise must be appraised in terms of benefits to them and all other students from alternative, less "special" programs.

On the other hand, there is no doubt at all, given a sufficient desire to intensify instructional and therapeutic training that this country could mobilize sufficient funds and people to give every child and youth approximate formal equality of opportunity from, say, age 4 onward. In 1975 there probably will be 99 million persons aged 5-29. Suppose that we allocate 9 millions to teaching and other educational duties, giving about 1 staff member to every 10 potential pupils (as compared with 1 staff member for every 27 pupils in 1958). This staff would constitute about 4 per cent of the total population or slightly less than 8 per cent of the age group, 20-64.

Could we "afford" this high proportion of the working-age population in educational occupations? Clearly the answer is, yes--if we were willing to give up their productive contributions in alternative occupations. Many of the needed persons could be women in the ages between 35 or 40 and 64 who otherwise would be housewives without young children of their own. But that there would be "costs", we could not deny.

The rising level of education probably is not simply a response to the growth of occupations that require high levels of education attainment. Indeed, between 1940 and 1960 ". . . about 85 per cent of the rise in educational attainment may be attributed to increased educational levels within occupations, and only 15 per cent to shifts in the occupational structure from occupations requiring less to occupations requiring more education."[50] Actually, within the broad occupational categories used in arriving at the above estimates there may have been a considerable amount of up-grading within specific occupations, and shifts toward technically-demanding industries may have further contributed to "hidden" demands for relatively high levels of training.

Furthermore, it begins to seem likely that many of the apparent "requirements" for education as a prerequisite for various types of jobs are not specifically functional but represent only a way of getting "well-adjusted" employees.

In many quarters of the educational system, however, there is an intense felt need to identify talent in order to select students for higher levels of education as well as to shunt them in the direction of various areas of specialization. One result is greater reliance on "objective, standardized tests of intelligence, aptitude, and academic achievement."[51] Another result is an increased effort to classify children at earlier and earlier ages. More and more what happens in elementary school or even in kindergarten directly affects the child's later educational career; decisions of long-term import may be made on the basis of quite early performance. As Goslin points out: "In the first place, earlier decisions are made about enrollment in subjects that lead either to a college preparatory or a vocational curriculum in secondary school; for example, many elementary and junior high schools are beginning to offer more than token instruction in foreign languages, science, and advanced mathematics. And, secondly, more and more schools allocate children to different classes according to their abilities, usually in part on the basis of standardized test scores."[52] Furthermore the results of early tests and evaluations usually become a part of the pupil's permanent record, to follow him thereafter.

Again, therefore, in our contemplation of the multiple loci of problems in this field, we return to an initial question, posed by Harold Taylor to the Conference: are we moving into a social order marked by democratic centralism with the trappings of a meritocracy, led by a specially selected and separately educated elite? If so, we may find that we have combined the human disadvantages of mass education with those of an alienated aristocracy of merit.

It seems, therefore, that while our discussion may have substantially expanded our field of vision, it has also complicated our aspirations and tempered out hopes.

In the largest city in the nation, the present annual budget for the schools approximates one billion dollars. That same city's school system struggles with vast problems of inequities in quality, with complex political pressures, and with all the vexations and friction of enormity of size. New

---

[50] John K. Folger and Charles B. Nam: "Trends in Education in Relation to the Occupational Structure," Sociology of Education, Vol. 38, No. 1, Fall, 1964, p. 29.

[51] Goslin, op. cit., p. 110.

[52] Goslin, op. cit., p. 111.

York City's school system is merely the demonstration on a wide screen of what all local systems increasingly have to face. Specialization plus large size everywhere tend to create complexity and bureaucracy. As Harold Taylor has indicated, a central emergent problem everywhere is how to find practicable institutional forms for dealing with large masses of pupils in such ways that individuality can be respected and personal growth encouraged, in some realistic and viable relation to the centers of choice, responsibility, and power in our society.

It is certain that the desired solutions (and there would have to be many more than one) cannot be found unless citizens who want high quality education on equal terms for all children can find the motivation and the social instrumentalities to bring organized pressure to bear upon the appropriate centers of decision-making and fund-appropriating, especially to offset the organized pressures of social elements that would like to destroy this vision of "democratic education" in a "free society". The effective use of the necessary tactics in the struggle for equality of quality is not easy to understand nor naturally congenial to the "liberal" forces in our American communities.

Much of what has happened and will happen to American public education represents actions not intentionally related to education at all. In an increasingly urbanized and suburbanized society, education is crucially affected by the massive processes of urban growth, decline, and transformation. For example: "The federal subsidies that have encouraged highway construction instead of mass commuter transportation and thus drawn industry out of the city have reduced the city's tax base. A lower tax base means less money for education and for the adjustment of rural migrants to urban life. Poor schools and changing neighborhoods encourage middle-class white families to move to the suburbs. Higher welfare costs increase the tax rate and thus encourage industry to relocate in outlying areas. All these factors are interrelated."[53] They are, indeed, interrelated. They constitute a network of power and consequences of power that urgently calls for precise understanding.

Our appraisal of possibilities for the future must be further tempered by the realization that one of the main keys to high quality in education is the supply of high-quality teachers; that supply cannot be greatly increased without large expenditures not only of funds, but also of talent and time exerted in efforts to improve working conditions, social recognition and prestige, and opportunities for professional advancement.[54]

---

[53] Bernard Weissbourd: "Segregation, Subsidies, and Megalopolis," Occasional Paper No. 1 on the City, The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, The Fund for the Republic, December, 1964, p. 6.

[54] "Raising the quality of teaching and consequently the professional commitment of teachers under conditions of inadequate rewards, increasing bureaucratization, and difficult working conditions looks like an almost impossible task, at least without some major reevaluation on the part of society to commit a larger share of its resources to education." (Goslin, op. cit., p. 145.)

It is often held today among those who comment publicly on such matters that ". . . the true wealth of a country and its basic security . . . depend upon . . . the intellectual leaders who are responsible for the discovery of new ideas and their translation into economic and social advances."[55] Undoubtedly, few reasonable men would wish to dispute this general statement, so far as it goes. What it does not do, among other things, is to call attention to the fact that "wealth" and "security" may also be highly dependent upon endurance, loyalty, tenacity, capacity for sacrifice, capacity for coordinated group action, motivation to work, and many other essentially "non-intellectual" qualities and performances. We suggest that there is not at this time a clear national consensus upon the priority of aims of our educational institutions. We, further, doubt that it would be wise at this time to attempt to precipitate a decision upon such a consensus.

It will be apparent by now that we do not foresee the immediate emergence of an educational Utopia in the United States. We do recognize the remarkable contribution of organized education to the accomplishments (and they are impressive accomplishment) of our industralized society.[56] We do recognize also that " . . . strictures on American education as 'class bound' suffer from lack of perspective."[57] Even before the Supreme Court decision in the _Brown_ case (1956), declaring unconstitutional forced racial segregation in the public schools, over three-fourths of our Negro youths aged 14-17 were enrolled in schools (such as they were). In comparison, school enrollment in 1957-1958 among youths aged 15-17 in England was less than one-fourth.

We are of the opinion that the main forces affecting education in the United States will move the total system more and more toward a highly differentiated state, in which quite different balances of "equality" and "quality" will be sought in various regions, states, localities--in the public and private schools--in various kinds of institutes, junior colleges, colleges, and universities.[58] And, again, in the interests of realistic tempering of aspirations, we recognize that at the higher levels of the system "equality of opportunity" to go to college obviously does not mean that just any opportunity to enter some college is equal to any other opportunity. As Cicourel and Kitsuse say, ". . . the theoretically significant distribution of high school seniors is not the gross college/non-college dichotomy, but the distribution of students according to their admission into colleges ranging from those having the highest applicant/enrollment ratio and admission requirements to those accepting any high school graduate."[59]

---

[55] Eli Ginzberg and John L. Herma, _et. al._: _Talent and Performance_, Columbia University Press, New York and London, 1964, p. 3.

[56] "In an advanced industrial society, it is inevitable that the educational system should come into close relationship with the economy. Modern industrial technology . . . is dependent to an unprecedented extent on the results of scientific research, on the supply of skilled and responsible manpower, and consequently on the efficiency of the educational system." (A. H. Halsey, _et. al._ (eds.): _op. cit._, p. 6.)

[57] C. Arnold Anderson: "Access to Higher Education and Economic Development," in A. H. Halsey, _et. al._, _op. cit._, p. 261.

[58] The U. S. A., in these regards, is not completely unique. "Education should therefore be relatively abundant, flexible, and capable of producing people with a high general level of culture, which makes them more adaptable to changing economic and social conditions." (Halsey, _et. al._, _op. cit._, p. 42.)

Probably by 1970 the western European industrialized nations will spend annually on education at least 6 per cent of the G. N. P., instead of 3-4 per cent at present. (Now the U. S. A. spends over 5 per cent; the U. S. S. R., over 7 per cent) (_Ibid_: p. 44.)

Nevertheless the ranges of opportunity we are developing are unprecedented in scope and variety. Indeed, as one considers education in the United States one eventually is forced to realize that a "complete" analysis would call for an exhaustive study of the total society--both as it now stands and as it may develop in an increasingly automated and computerized phase in the years just ahead.[60] With this observation we have, in a sense, come full circle in this chapter. For a great deal of education of very high quality will be needed to cope at all adequately with the social tasks that those years will bring.

---

[59] Aaron V. Cicourel and John I. Kitsuse: The Educational Decision-Makers, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., New York, 1963, p. 7.

[60] See Robert Boguslaw: The New Utopians: A Study of System Design and Social Change, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1965.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL COSTS OF QUALITY AND EQUALITY IN EDUCATION*

Urie Bronfenbrenner
Cornell University

The costs of quality and equality in education--calculated, as they usually are, in dollars and cents--invariably turn out to be higher than expected. Not infrequently the public is unwilling to pay the price, and even when it does so, it is often with reluctance, pain, and resentment, both toward those who impose the payment and those who receive the benefits. The reasons for resistance are well known. Personal financial resources are slow to acquire, the demand invariably exceeds the supply, and what little we have is urgently needed to provide for ourselves and our families.

The sobering burden of this chapter is to show that all these considerations apply with even greater force when the costs of quality and inequality are reckoned in psychological rather than economic terms. Here too the price turns out to be far higher than anticipated, but the available resources are even more limited, the needs of self and family more pressing, and the pain and resentment at having to pay the price far more acute. Yet, these costs will have to be met, for unless they are, no increase in school budget however generous, no regrouping of pupils however democratic, no new curriculum however adapted to the child's environment can bring either quality or equality in education to those who do not have them.

To understand why this is so, we must come to terms with an unwelcome but nonetheless inexorable reality: whatever their origin, the most immediate, overwhelming, and stubborn obstacles to achieving quality and equality in education lie as much in the character and way of life of the American Negro as in the indifference and hostility of the white community. The first part of this chapter summarizes the bases for this assertion.

The Psychological Characteristics of the Negro Child. Recognition in actual practice of the critical role played by psychological factors in the education of the Negro child begins with implementation of the 1954 Supreme Court decision that separate facilities are inherently unequal. Unfortunately, it all too often ends there. In many American communities the enlightened leadership, both Negro and white, and their supporters operate on the tacit assumption that once the Negro child finds himself in an integrated classroom with a qualified teacher and adequate materials, learning will take place, and with it the deficiencies of the American Negro, and the judgments of inferiority which they in part encourage, will be erased.

Regrettably, this is not the case. Neither the scars of slavery which the Negro child still bears nor the skills and self-confidence of his white companion rub off merely through contact in the same classroom. This is not to imply that integration is impotent as an instrument of change. On the contrary, it is a desperately necessary condition, but not a sufficient one. Objective equality of opportunity is not enough. The Negro child must also be able to profit from the educational situation in which he finds himself. This he cannot do if he lacks the background and motivation necessary for learning. And the evidence indicates that these essentials are conspicuously absent.

---

*Prepared as a chapter in Tumin, M. and Bressler, M. _Quality and Equality in Education_ (in preparation, October 1965).

Let us examine the data. Fortunately, most of the relevant facts are already brought together for us in Pettigrew's (1964) recent volume A Profile of the Negro American, a masterful compendium and interpretation of the available research findings. We shall not concern ourselves here with the full array of facts which Pettigrew presents; they are eloquent testimony to the crippling psychological costs to the Negro of the inequality imposed upon him by slavery and its contemporary economic and social heritage. For our purposes we select those findings that bear directly and indirectly on the educability of the Negro child of poverty.

The first of these is the sobering statistic that the longer such a child remains in school, even in integrated classrooms, the further behind he falls in relation to the norms for his age and grade. Such progressive retardation is reported not only for measures of academic achievement (Deutsch, 1960; Kennedy, Van de Riet, and White, 1963) but also for scores on tests of general intelligence (Deutsch and Brown, 1964; Kennedy, et al., 1963; Pettigrew, 1964, Chapt. 5). Moreover, the discrepancies between Negro and white children are not limited to poverty-stricken families. They are not only present across the socio-economic spectrum but "the Negro-White differences increase at each higher SES level" (Deutsch and Brown, 1964, p. 27).

In analyzing the factors producing these results, investigators call attention to the inappropriateness of many test items to lower class Negro culture. But at the same time they make clear that improvements in test construction will not change the fact of the Negro child's inferiority; he suffers from handicaps that are real and debilitating. For example, Deutsch (1960) cites evidence that, in comparison with white children from deprived socio-economic background, lower class Negro youngsters are especially retarded in reading and language skills. They also show a shorter attention span in any task which requires concentration and persistence. Deutsch's observations indicate that the failure in persistence reflects not only an inability to concentrate but also a lack of motivation and an attitude of futility in the face of difficulty. Thus he reports:

> Time after time, the experimental child would drop a problem posed by the teacher as soon as he met any difficulty in attempting to solve it. In questioning after, the child would typically respond "so what?" or "who cares" or "what does it matter?" In the control group (white children of "similar socio-economic level"), there was an obvious competitive spirit, with a verbalized anticipation of "reward" for a correct response. In general, this anticipation was only infrequently present in the experimental group and was not consistently or meaningfully reenforced by the teachers (p. 9).

Deutsch's observations are confirmed by a series of studies, cited by Pettigrew (1964, pp. 30-31), showing that "lower class Negro children of school age typically 'give up the fight' and reveal unusually low need for achievement."

Not only does the Negro child feel powerless; he feels worthless as well. At the core of this sense of inferiority is the awareness of being black. From the age of three onward, Negro children begin to prefer white skin to black and to think of Negroes in general and themselves in particular as ugly, unwanted, and "bad." Results of the numerous studies of this phenomenon, summarized by Pettigrew (1964, Chapt. 1), are epitomized in an example he cites of a small Negro boy who served as a subject in one of these investigations. "Asked if he were white or colored, he hung his head and hesitated. Then he murmured softly, 'I guess I'se kind o' colored' " (p. 8).

It is this "mark of oppression" which distinguishes the personality development of the Negro child from that of his white counterpart, especially in lower class families. The psychological process and its consequences are summarized by the following excerpt from a more extended analysis by Ausubel (1958).

> The Negro child...gradually becomes aware of the social significance of racial membership... He perceives himself as an object of derision and disparagement, as socially rejected by the prestigeful elements of society, and as unworthy of succorance and affection. Having no compelling reasons for not accepting this officially sanctioned, negative evaluation of himself, he develops ingrained feelings of inferiority (p. 35).

It is all these intellectual, motivational, and emotional problems that the Negro child brings with him when he goes to school. The obstacles they place to the learning process are reflected in the marked contrast in classroom atmosphere reported by Deutsch (1960) in his study of schools in Negro and White lower class neighborhoods. In the former setting, 50 to 80 percent of all classroom time was "devoted to disciplinary and various essentially non-academic tasks," whereas the corresponding percentage for the white control group was about 30 (pp. 7-8).

What factors account for the special debilities and behavior difficulties of Negro children? The thesis, still militantly upheld by some investigators (Garrett, 1960, 1961, 1962a, 1962b; McGurk, 1956, 1959; Shuey, 1958; Van den Haag, 1964), that such deficiencies have an innate basis in race differences, has been so thoroughly discredited (Anastasi, 1956; Chein, 1961; Pettigrew, 1964) that it needs no consideration here. We would call attention, however, to one additional fact which, if acknowledged, presents an interesting problem to those who seek to account for Negro inferiority in genetic terms. The intellectual, emotional, and social deficiencies observed in Negro children are considerably more pronounced in boys than in girls. Systematic data on this point are cited by Deutsch (1960). For instance, in his sample of Negro school children in grades 4-6 the proportion who scored below fourth grade norms on the Stanford Achievement Test was 38% for girls and 68% for boys, the discrepancies being greatest on the reading sub-test. No differences approaching this magnitude were found for the white controls. Similarly, in repeating digits forward or backward, Negro girls performed at about the same level as white controls, whereas Negro boys were markedly inferior to their white counterparts. Deutsch stresses the psychological significance of this difference in view of "the importance of attention for any academic learning and therefore the potential contribution of lowered attentivity to the achievement differences found" (p. 12). It is noteworthy that these sex differences in achievement are observed among Southern as well as Northern Negroes, are present at every socio-economic level, and tend to increase with age (Kennedy, et al., 1963, see especially Tables 68 and 69).

The Sources of Inadequacy. Clearly any satisfactory explanation for the debilities of the Negro child must also account for the special ineptitude of the Negro male. Several lines of evidence are pertinent in this regard: the first is biological, the remainder social.

Organic bases of inadequacy. Though the Negro infant is not biologically inferior at the moment of conception, he often becomes so shortly thereafter. The inadequate nutrition and prenatal care received by millions of Negro mothers result in complications of pregnancy which take their toll in extraordinarily high rates of prematurity and congenital defect (Knobloch, Rider, Harper, and Pasamanick, 1956; Pasamanick, Knobloch, and Lilienfeld, 1956; Pasamanick and Knobloch, 1958). Many of these abnormalities entail neurological damage resulting in impaired intellectual function and behavioral disturbances, including hyperactivity, distractibility, and low attention span. Of particular relevance is the significant role played by paranatal and prenatal factors in the genesis of childhood reading disorders. In a retrospective comparison of hospital records, Kawi and Pasamanick (1959) found that instances of two or more complications of pregnancy were over nine times as frequent in the records of mothers whose children later exhibited severe reading difficulties as in a control population matched on social class and other relevant variables. Finally, it is a well established, though not thoroughly understood, fact that neurological disorders resulting from complications of pregnancy and birth are considerably more frequent for males than females. This differential rate has been identified as a major factor in contributing to the consistent sex differences observed in incidence of neuropsychiatric disorders and psychological disturbances in children.* Of special relevance in this connection is the statistic, cited by Pasamanick and Knoblock (1958, p. 7), that "behavior disorders are two to three times more common in boys, reading disorders as much as eight or nine times." These authors see in "reproductive casualty" and its sequelae a major factor contributing to school retardation in Negro children generally and Negro males in particular. Organic debilities of course result not only in intellectual dysfunction but also in discouragment. In this manner they play a part in evoking the expectations of failure, the readiness to give up in the face of difficulty, and the low level of aspiration observed in Negro children, especially among boys.

The impact of paternal absence. But even where organic factors do not set in motion the vicious circle of defeat and disinterest in achievement, social circumstances can be counted on to instigate and accelerate a similar downward spiral. A growing body of research evidence points to the debilitating effect on personality development in Negro children, particularly males, resulting from the high frequency of father-absence in Negro families. The extent of such absence is eloquently reflected in census figures summarized by Pettigrew (1964).

> Census data for 1960 illustrate the depth of this family disorganization among Negroes: over a third (34.3 per cent) of all non-white mothers with children under six years of age hold jobs as compared with less than a fifth (19.5 per cent) of white mothers with children under six; only three fourths (74.9 per cent) of all non-white families have both the husband and the wife present in the household as compared with nin-tenths (89.2 per cent) of white families[8]; and only two-thirds (66.3 per cent) of non-white under eighteen years of age live with both of their parents as compared with nine-tenths (90.2 per cent) of such whites...
>
> ---
>
> [8] The vast majority of incomplete Negro households is lacking the husband. Frazier estimated in 1950 that the male parent was missing in roughly 20 per cent of Negro households. In addition to divorce and separation, part of this phenomenon is due to a higher Negro male death rate. The percentage of widows among Negro women fifty-four years old or less is roughly twice that of white women. (pp. 16-17)

---

*The numerous studies supporting this finding are summarized by Kawi and Pasamanick (1959, p. 19).

The consequence of this state of affairs for the personality development of the Negro child is indicated by several lines of investigations. First, a series of studies conducted in the United States (Bach, 1946; Sears, 1951; Sears, et al., 1946; Stolz, 1954) and Norway (Grønseth, 1957; Lynn and Sawrey, 1959; Tiller, 1957, 1961) showed that father absence has far greater impact on sons than on daughters. The results, and their implications, are summarized by Pettigrew as follows:

> ...father-deprived boys are markedly more immature, submissive, dependent, and effeminate than other boys... As they grow older, this passive behavior may continue, but more typically, it is vigorously overcompensated for by exaggerated masculinity. Juvenile gangs, white and Negro classically act out this pseudo-masculinity with leather jackets, harsh language, and physical "toughness." (1964, p. 18)

Consistent with this same line of evidence are the results of a substantial number of studies pointing to the importance of paternal absence and inadequacy in the genesis of delinquent behavior (Bacon, Child, and Barry, 1963; Bandura and Walters, 1959; Burton and Whiting, 1961; Glueck and Glueck, 1950, 1956; Miller, 1958; Rohrer and Edmonson, 1960; Scarpitti, Murray, Dinitz, and Reckless, 1960). In seeking an explanation for this relationship, several of the major investigators have concluded that the exaggerated toughness, aggressiveness, and cruelty of delinquent gangs reflect the desperate effort of males in lower class culture to rebel against their early overprotective, feminizing environment and to find a masculine identity. For example, Miller analyzes the dynamics of the process in the following terms:

> The genesis of the intense concern over "toughness" in lower class culture is probably related to the fact that a significant proportion of lower class males are reared in a predominantly female household, and lack a consistently present male figure with whom to identify and from whom to learn essential components of a "male" role. Since women serve as a primary object of identification during pre-adolescent years, the almost obsessive lower class concern with "masculinity" probably resembles a type of compulsive reaction-formation... A positive overt evaluation of behavior defined as "effeminate" would be out of the question for a lower class male. (p. 9)

The special relevance of this dynamic for public education is indicated in a similar conclusion drawn by Rohrer and Edmondson in their follow-up study of Negro youth in New Orleans. "The gang member rejects this femininity in every form, and he sees it in women and in effeminate men, in laws and morals and religion, in schools, and occupational striving." (1960, p. 163)

Despite their desperate effort to prove the contrary, a latent femininity is nevertheless present in "fatherless" youngsters and results in a confused sex-identity. Substantial support for this argument is found in the impressive number of studies, summarized by Pettigrew, which show that Negro men, especially those from lower class homes, obtain high scores on indirect measures of femininity. Additional evidence points to father-absence as a critical factor. In comparison with a control group from intact homes, Negroes whose fathers were absent during early childhood were far more likely to either single or divorced; in addition, "they also felt more victimized, less in control of the environment, and more distrustful of others." (Pettigrew, 1964, p. 20)

Nor are the consequences of paternal absence limited to the emotional and social sphere. A recent series of investigations by Mischel (1958, 1961a, 1961b, 1961c) points to the crucial role of this same factor in the development of a capacity essential to achievement generally and academic acheivement in particular--the ability to delay immediate gratification in order to obtain a later reward. The systematic investigation of this phenomenon was suggested to the investigator by anthropological reports alleging "a major personality difference" between Negro and East Indian groups on the island of Trinidad.

> This difference, as expressed by numerous informants, is that the Negroes are impulsive, indulge themselves, settle for next to nothing if they can get it right away, do not work or wait for bigger things in the future but, instead, prefer smaller gains immediately. (1958, p. 57)

In a series of ingenious experiments (e.g., a child is offered a choice between a tiny candy bar now, versus a larger bar in a week's time), Mischel (1958, 1961c) demonstrated that the preference for immediate gratification was a distinguishing characteristic observable in Negro children of 10 years of age and that the cultural difference could be attributed primarily, but not entirely, to the greater absence of the father among Negro families. In addition, the same investigator has shown that the desire for immediate gratification is associated with poorer accuracy in judging time, less achievement drive, lower levels of social responsibility, and a greater propensity toward delinquent behavior (Mischel, 1961a, 1961b).

The impact of paternal absence on actual school performance is reflected in Deutsch's (1960) finding that lower class Negro children from broken homes were far more likely to score below grade level on tests of academic achievement than their classmates from intact families, and that the higher frequency of broken homes among Negro families accounted for most of the difference in achievement between the Negro and white samples. Moreover, children from intact families did better in school than those from broken homes despite the fact that intact homes were more crowded, a circumstance which leads Deutsch to conclude that "who lives in the room is more important than how many." (p. 10) In a subsequent study, Deutsch and Brown (1964) have shown that a significant difference of about eight points in IQ is specifically attributable to absence of the father from the home.

Finally, it is not only the absence of the Negro father that prevents the son from seeing the future realistically. Also relevant is the inferior position held by the adult Negro male in the economic world. In the matter of occupational choice the Negro boy has few models to emulate that are actually within the realm of his possible achievement. This circumstance is reflected in a study of occupational aspirations among lower class children (Deutsch, 1960, pp. 11-14). When asked what they wanted to be when they grew up, 25% of the Negro boys named high prestige professions such as doctor, lawyer, etc. In contrast, Negro girls were more realistic in scaling down their aspirations to goals within their reach. Deutsch accounts for this difference in terms of the greater availability for the girls of an accepted role model both within the family and in the outside world.

The impoverished environment. We see, then, that both the high incidence of perinatal pathology and of paternal absence among lower class Negroes have produced psychological deficits and disturbances in Negro children, particularly boys. But there are other early influences, equally baneful, which do not discriminate between the sexes. Among these is another product of poverty, the absence of an educationally stimulating environment during the pre-school years. Studies of this phenomenon* indicate that the lower class Negro home is barren of objects (books, newspapers, pencils, paper, toys, games) and of coherent social interaction. For example, in a study of the "Social World of the Urban Slums," Keller (1963) reports that the children had little sustained contact with adults, few organized conversations, and little shared family activity. In the same vein, a comparison of Negro and white lower class children (Deutsch, 1960) revealed that the former had fewer books in the home, got less help with their homework, took fewer trips beyond a 25-block radius from their home, ate less frequently with their parents, and spent less time with them on Sundays. Also, such verbal interaction with parents as did occur tended to be limited in complexity and completeness. For example, commands were likely to be one or several words rather than complete sentences and were typically given without explanation or elaboration.

Patterns of child rearing. An additional factor contributing to the inadequacies and problems of the Negro child is the alternately repressive and indulgent pattern of upbringing found in lower class families in general (Bronfenbrenner, 1958) and Negro lower class families in particular (Davis, 1941; Davis and Dollard, 1940; Davis and Havighurst, 1946; Frazier, 1957; Rohrer and Edmonson, 1960). Discipline is exercised principally by the mother, is focused on overt acts rather than motives or goals, and is mainly inhibitory in character; that is, the child is told not to do this or that, to keep quiet, not ask questions, stay out of trouble. The effect of such negative reenforcement is to discourage early initiative, curiosity and exploration, as well as cooperative interaction with a guiding adult.

The legacy of slavery. It is noteworthy how many of the characteristics of the Negro family of today which are dysfunctional for modern society were functional for or at least adaptive to the conditions of bondage (Frazier, 1957). With the father constantly in risk of being sold to another owner, a matriarchal family structure became almost inevitable. But since the mother too had to work, it was necessary to keep the child from interfering by his activity, questions, or misbehavior. Moreover, as McClelland (1961) has pointed out, slavery is incompatible with and destructive of a high drive for achievement, since the rewards of the slave come not from initiative and independence but compliance. "Negro slaves should, therefore, have developed child-rearing practices calculated to produce obedience and responsibility not n- (need for) Achievement, and their descendants, while free, should still show the effects of such training in lower n-Achievement." (pp. 376-377) In keeping with this prediction, Negro adolescents have the lowest achievement scores among youth from six different ethnic groups in the United States (Rosen, 1959).

But the most important legacies of slavery were the conditions in which the American Negro found himself upon release from bondage--economic poverty and racial discrimination. The three together--slavery, poverty, and discrimination--lie at the root of the biological and social forces which produce widespread psychological debility and disturbance in the Negro child. From this perspective it is the white man who is in the first instance primarily responsible for the inadequacies of the Negro and his way of life.

---

*For a review of the relevant research literature, see Bloom, Davis, and Hess (1965).

The Integrated Classroom and the Disintegrated Child. But allocation, or even acceptance of responsibility for damage does not do away with the Negro child's deficiencies. Nor does placing him in an integrated classroom. On his arrival there he brings with him his full array of defects and disruptive behaviors. True, being able at least to sit with his white age mates may, under certain circumstances*, bolster his self-esteem and provide him with more competent models to emulate. But integration cannot repair a damaged brain, supply a father, equip a home with books, or alter a family's values, speech habits, and patterns of child rearing. Thus in many cases the Negro child in the integrated classroom is, and continues to be, intellectually retarded, unable to concentrate, unmotivated to learn; at first apathetic, but as he gets older, becoming resentful, rebellious, and delinquency-prone.

What is more, in the integrated classroom all of these characteristics of the Negro child have their impact on his white companion. To begin with, unless countermeasures are introduced, they provide an objective basis and emotional provocation for devaluating and rejecting the Negro, thus reactivating and reenforcing the vicious circle of discrimination and defeat**. But the white child is affected in other ways as well. The learning difficulties of the Negro pupil, if they are taken into consideration by the teacher, slow up the rest of the class. Similarly, disruptions by some impede teaching for all. Finally, while it is true that white children in an integrated classroom function as models for their Negro companions, the reverse process is equally in effect. As has been demonstrated both in field (Polansky, Lippitt, and Redl, 1954) and experimental (Bandura and Walters, 1963) studies, disintegrative and destructive behavior of peers is highly subject to contagion against which contrasting values and practices of the family provide little immunity. In other words, the white child is likely to take on some of the aggressive and disruptive activities of his Negro classmates to the further detriment of his work in school. Such developments are of course viewed with alarm by many white parents, who become understandably concerned about the consequences of integration for the education and character development of their children. In short, in the integrated classroom, the problems of the Negro child become, at least in part, those of the white child as well. Thus the costs of inequality to the Negro become the costs of equality to the white.

Countermeasures and Consequences. Nor do these costs end with the impact on the classroom of the inappropriate behavior of the Negro child. While the damage already done to the latter by the time he enters school cannot be undone completely, some counteractive measures can be taken within the school environment, or under it auspices, which may entail still further psychological problems for the white community. For example, to a limited but significant extent a male teacher can serve some of the functions of the absent or inadequate father. The high incidence of fatherless families in the Negro lower class argues strongly for the involvement of many more men as teachers at the elementary level. The psychological costs here, to the extent that any exist, lie in the low prestige and consequent threat to self-esteem which elementary teaching holds for men in American society. This threat may be alleviated in part by the special need for Negro men as primary teachers, and these are not as likely to resent the role.

---

*Available research evidence on conditions producing both favorable and detrimental effects in integrated classrooms is summarized in Katz (1964).

**It is of course often the most able Negro children who are subjected to the most severe isolation and insult in desegregated settings. On the effects of stress experienced by Negro pupils in some integrated schools see Coles (1963) and Katz (1964).

But they themselves may often be resented by the white community, not only on grounds of racial prejudice but also on the basis of their teaching effectiveness. Only a small proportion of Negro teachers have been able to enjoy the same educational opportunities, from early childhood on, as were available to their white colleagues and, for the reasons already outline, it is the Negro male who is most likely to have been disadvantaged. For this reason if Negro teachers--especially Negro men--are employed in the large numbers in which they are needed, there will be a drop in the general level of instruction, for these teachers will not have as good command of subject matter as their predecessors, and their speech will deviate from the white middle class norm. Yet, despite these deficiencies, such persons can do much more for the education of the Negro child than the better-educated more acculturated white or Negro female who would otherwise be their teacher.

But exposing the Negro child to a male teacher of his own race is not enough. Given the absence of positive male figures in his out-of-school environment, he requires additional acquaintance with Negro men who, by their example, demonstrate the possibility and attraction of masculine competence and constructive conduct in a variety of spheres. This need could be met through programs of after-school activities conducted by persons--both Negro and white--who posess such diverse skills and who have found a place in their community. The objective of such programs would be not so much to take the youngster off the streets (although they would have this effect if successful) as to involve him in patterns of interaction which can develop the basic skills, motives, and qualities necessary for a child to be able to profit from the classroom experience. In other words, these after-school activities are to be viewed as an essential part of the educational process falling within the responsibility of those agencies charged with providing public instruction.

It should be stressed that the after-school program here envisioned is not offering pre-vocational training. Quite the contrary. The activities would be non-technical in nature and would begin at levels accessible and attractive to the lower class child--sports, games, selected movies, outings. At the outset such activities would have to be conducted by persons trained or experienced in recreational activities, but gradually other adults would participate in them and the child would discover that one was a machinist, another worked in a bank, a third was a reporter on a newspaper, etc. The objective is to expose the child to and induce him to emulate models embodying the values, skills, and aspirations necessary for achievement in school and society.

There is no question that such programs would be difficult to develop and to administer, but there is some evidence that they are practicable. For example, in Soviet schools, members of the community are deliberately and regularly brought in to accompany and participate with youngsters in after-school activites, hikes, expeditions, etc. with the explicit aim of exposing the youngster to intimate contact with adults who combine specialized knowledge or skill with sterling and attractive qualities of character (of course from the Communist point of view). A related practice long employed in Soviet schools is the involvement of able adolescents and pre-adolescents in activities with young children. Recently, similar utilization of this age group, under appropriate supervision, has been urged in our own country in connection with Project Headstart--the federally sponsored preschool program for children in economically deprived areas. An issue of the Head Start Newsletter (1965) points to the fact that high school students can in certain respects function more effectively than adults in working with young children: "Grown-ups, no matter how friendly and helpful, are in an important sense, in a world apart. Their abilities, skills, and standards are so clearly superior to those of the child as to appear beyond his grasp."

It is of course important that persons working in such programs, be they adults or teen-agers, not be restricted to one race, but the same consideration applies for the children as well. Unless white youngsters are also involved in after-school programs, the activity once again becomes identified as an operation for second-class, second-rate citizens. Nor is it sufficient if participation is limited to children--Negro and white--coming from deprived backgrounds. A growing body of research (summarized in Bronfenbrenner 1962; Millsom 1966) points to the conclusion that peers are at least as effective if not more potent than adults in their capacity to influence the behavior of the child. From this point of view, it is desirable that children from more favored environments also be included in after-school activities, and, if they are, they are of course exposed to the deleterious as well as constructive influences present in that situation.

The after-school program has other difficulties as well. Indeed some of these difficulties are a direct function of the degree to which the program achieves its objectives. For, to the extent that the Negro child acquires the skills and values of his new companions, he becomes further removed from his own family. The conflict which such separation can arouse both within the family and within the child himself can undermine whatever progress has been made and lead ultimately to debilitating problems of self-identity.* Because of the danger, it is necessary that, in so far as possible, the child's parents also be actively involved in their child's new activities and new world. To modify the pattern of life of parents is of course far more difficult than to influence their children, but some opportunities nevertheless exist. One approach is that being employed in Project Headstart (Report of Planning Committee, 1965) where parents from low income families participate as "paid volunteers" in a variety of tasks requiring little formal education or experience but at the same time involving close contact with professional workers as they interact with children. In this manner, some parents--or more realistically, some mothers--are exposed to new and different attitudes and methods in dealing with young children. The device employed in Project Headstart illustrates a general principle the validity of which has been demonstrated in a substantial body of research in behavioral science generally and in the study of intergroup relations in particular; namely, that attitudes and behaviors are changed most readily when people work together in pursuit of a common goal to which they are committed (Sherif 1958; Williams, 1947, 1964). And the goal of bettering life for children is one which most parents are willing to pursue.

If we apply the foregoing principle more generally to the role of parents in programs for disadvantaged children in school and out, we come to a conclusion that should properly give us pause; namely, the principle implies that parental involvement is necessary not only on the part of underprivileged families, but of the privileged as well. It is only through non-antagonistic exposure to the different view and the different practice that the lower class parent can come to tolerate and understand--if not to adopt--the different way of dealing with his child employed by those charged with responsibility for his education. Accordingly, it becomes necessary for parents from more privileged circumstances--Negro as well as white--to become actively involved in programs concerned with the education of their children both in school and out.

---

*Regrettably this phenomenon has not yet been investigated systematically by psychologists. The best available data and analyses of the Negro's identity crisis appear in the works of such gifted Negro writers as Richard Wright (1951) and James Baldwin (1955, 1961).

We are asking a great deal. As we said at the outset of this chapter, the psychological costs of quality and equality in education for all the children are high. They require a new conception of the scope of public education as extending beyond school walls and school hours. They call for a far greater involvement in education of parents and other members of the adult community. They require a sacrifice in academic advancement for children from advantaged families to make possible academic survival for children from disadvantaged families. In short, they demand heavy payment from the Have's in favor of the Have-not's, not just in money, but in the far harder coin of psychological security and status.

And if we who have are willing to pay, what is achieved? Whatever we pay, cannot be enough. Those who receive payment, will still feel cheated, and rightly so. One cannot repay to the children of slaves the present costs of ancient bondage.

It is the tragedy and paradox of injustice that those who seek to right it gain as much if not more than those who have been wronged. Paradoxically, it is not the disadvantaged Negro alone who would benefit from equality in education were we truly to achieve it. For the only way in which we can give the Negro child equality is to teach the white child how to treat him equally. This will not happen from mere physical association in the classroom. It will require the actual teaching and practice in school and out, of the principles of human dignity to which our society is dedicated. It is a sobering fact that in communist schools a deliberate effort is made to teach the child, through concrete experience, the values and behaviors most consistent with communist ideals. In American schools, training for action consistent with social responsibility and human dignity is at best an extra-curricular activity. The belated recognition of our educational obligations to the child of poverty, white or black, offers us a chance to redress this weakness and to make democratic education not only a principle but a process.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anastasi, Anne, "Intelligence and Family Size," Psychological Bulletin, 1956, 53, 187-209.

Ausubel, D. P., "Ego Development among Segregated Negro Children," Mental Hygiene, 1958, 42, 362-369.

Bach, G. R., "Father-Fantasies and Father-Typing in Father-Separated Children," Child Development, 1946, 17, 63-79.

Bacon, M. K., Child, I. L., and Barry, H. III, "A Cross-Cultural Study of Correlates of Crime," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 291-300.

Bandura, A. and Walters, R. H., Adolescent Aggression, New York: Ronald, 1959.

Bandura, A. and Walters, R. H., Social Learning and Personality Development, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Bloom, B. S., Davis, A. and Hess, R., Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Bronfenbrenner, U., "Socialization and Social Class Through Time and Space," In Maccoby, E., Newcomb, T. M. and Hartley, E. L., Readings in Social Psychology, New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1958, pp. 400-425.

Bronfenbrenner, U., "Soviet Methods of Character Education", American Psychologist, August 1962, Vol. 17, No. 8, pp. 550-564.

Burton, R. V. and Whiting, J. W. M., "The Absent Father and Cross-Sex Identity," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1961, 7, 85-95

Chein, I., "The Roots of a Conspiracy," SPSSI Newsletter, December 1961.

Coles, R., The Desegregation of Southern Schools: A Psychiatric Study. New York: Anti-Defamation League, 1963.

Davis, A., Deep South, Chicago: U. of Chicago Press, 1941.

Davis, A. and Dollard, J., Children of Bondage, Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1940

Davis, A. and Havighurst, R. J., "Social Class and Color Differences in Child-Rearing," American Sociological Review, 1946, 11, 698-710.

Deutsch, M., "Minority Group and Class Status as Related to Social and Personality Factors in Scholastic Achievement," Monograph of the Society for Applied Anthropology, 1960, no. 2, 1-32.

Deutsch, M. and Brown, B., "Social Influences in Negro-White Intelligence Differences," Journal of Social Issues, 1964, 20 (2).

Frazier, E. F., The Negro in the United States. Revised edition, New York: MacMillan, 1957.

Garrett, H. E. "Klineberg's Chapter on Race and Psychology: A Review," *The Mankind Quarterly*, 1960, *1*, 15-22.

Garrett, H. E., "The Equalitarian Dogma," *Mankind Quarterly*, 1961, *1*, 253-257.

Garrett, H. E., "Rejoinder by Garrett," *Newsletter of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues*, May 1962a, 1-2

Garrett, H. E., "The SPSSI and Racial Differences," *American Psychologist*, 1962b, *17*, 260-263.

Glueck, S. and Glueck, E. T., *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*, New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1950.

Glueck, S. and Glueck, E. T., *Physique and Delinquency*, New York: Harper & Bros., 1956.

Grønseth, E., "The Impact of Father Absence in Sailor Families Upon the Personality Structure and Social Adjustment of Adult Sailor Sons. Part I." in Anderson, N. (Ed.) *Studies of the Family*, Vol. 2, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1957, pp. 97-114.

Headstart Newsletter, No. 2, July 1965, Published by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Katz, I., "Review of Evidence Relating to Effects of Desegregation on the Intellectual Performance of Negroes," *Amer. Psychol.*, 1964, *19*, 381-399.

Kawi, A. A. and Pasamanick, B., "Prenatal and Paranatal Factors in the Development of Childhood Reading Disorders," *Monogr. Soc. Res. Child Developm.*, 1959, *24*, No. 4.

Keller, S., "The Social World of the Urban Slum Child: Some Early Findings," *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.*, 1963, 33, 823-831.

Kennedy, W. A., Van de Riet, V. and White, J. C., Jr., "A Normative Sample of Intelligence and Achievement of Negro Elementary School Children in the Southeastern United States," *Monogr. Soc. Res. Child Developm*, 1963, 28, No. 6

Knobloch, H., Rider, R., Harper, P. and Pasamanick, B., "Neural Psychiatric Sequelae of Prematurity," *J. Amer. Med. Ass.*, 1956, *161*, 581-585.

Lott, A. J. and Lott, B. E., *Negro and White Youth: A Psychological Study in a Border-State Community*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Lynn, D. B. and Sawrey W. L., "The Effects of Father-Absence on Norwegian Boys and Girls," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1959, *59*, 258-262.

McClelland, D. C., *The Achieving Society*, Princeton, N. J.: Van Nostrand, 1961.

McGurk, F., "Psychological Tests: A Scientist's Report on Race Differences," *U. S. News and World Report*, September 21, 1956, 92-96.

McGurk, F., "Negro vs. White Intelligence--An Answer," *Harvard Educational Review*, 1959, *29*, 54-62.

Miller, W. B., "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency," Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 14 (3), 5-19.

Millsom, C., Conformity to Peers versus Adults in Early Adolescence. Ph. D. Dissertation, submitted to the Graduate School of Cornell University, February 1966.

Mischel, W., "Preference for Delayed Reinforcement and Experimental Study of a Cultural Observation," J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1958, 56, 57-61.

Mischel, W., "Preference for Delayed Reinforcement and Social Responsibility," J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1961a, 62, 1-7.

Mischel, W., "Delay of Gratification, Need for Achievement, and Acquiescence in Another Culture," J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1961b, 62, 543-552.

Mischel, W., "Father-Absence and Delay of Gratification: Cross-Cultural Comparisons," J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1961c, 63, 116-124.

Pasamanick, B., Knobloch, H. and Lilienfeld, A. M., "Socioeconomic Status and Some Precursors of Neuropsychiatric Disorder," Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1956, 26, 594-601.

Pasamanick, B. and Knobloch, H., "The Contribution of Some Organic Factors to School Retardation in Negro Children," Journal of Negro Education, 1958, 27, 4-9.

Pettigrew, T. F., A Profile of the Negro American, Princeton, N.J.: VanNostrand, 1964.

Polansky, N., Lippitt, R., and Redl, F., "An Investigation of Behavioral Contagion in Groups," In Martin, W. E. and Stendler, C. B., Readings in Child Development, New York: Harcourt Brace, 1954, 493-513.

Report of the Planning Committee, Project Head Start, Office of Economic Opportunity, 1965.

Rohrer, J. H. and Edmonson, M. S. (Eds.), The Eighth Generation. New York: Harper, 1960.

Rosen, B. C., "Race, Ethnicity, and the Achievement Syndrome," American Sociological Review, 1959, 24, 47-60.

Scarpitti, F. R., Murray, E., Dinitz, S., and Reckless, W. C., "The 'Good' Boy in a High Delinquency Area: Four Years Later," American Sociological Review, 1960, 25, 555-558.

Sears, P. S., "Doll Play Aggression in Normal Young Children: Influence of Sex, Age, Sibling Status, Father's Absence," Psychological Monographs, 1951, 65 (6), (Whole no. 323).

Sears, R. R., Pintler, M. H. and Sears, P. S., "Effects of Father-Separation on Pre-school Children's Doll Play Aggression," Child Development, 1946, 17, 219-243.

Sherif, M., "Superordinate Goals in the Reduction of Intergroup Tensions," American J. Sociology, 1958, 53, 349-356.

Shuey, A., The Testing of Negro Intelligence, Lynchburg, Va.: Bell, 1958.

Stolz, L. M., Father Relations of Warborn Children. Palo Alto, Cal.: Stanford University Press. 1954.

Tiller, P. O., "Father Absence and Personality Development of Children in Sailor Families: A Preliminary Research Report. Part II." In Anderson, N. (Ed.) Studies of the Family, Vol. 2, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1957, pp. 115-137.

Tiller, P. O., Father-Separation and Adolescence. Oslo: Institute for Social Research, 1961 (mimeographed).

Van den Haag, "Negroes' Intelligence and Prejudice," National Review, December 1, 1964.

Williams, R. M., Jr., The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions. Bulletin 57, New York: Social Science Research Council, 1947.

Williams, R. M., Jr., Strangers Next Door. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1964.

QUALITY AND EQUALITY IN AMERICAN EDUCATION: A PARTISAN ESSAY

Melvin M. Tumin and Marvin Bressler

The United States is now engaged in a revolutionary effort to provide free, public, and high quality education to all the young people of the society, regardless not only of differences in race, religion, or national origin, but, more important, regardless of their differences in talent and ability.

Some will argue that to assert such a commitment exists is surely an overstatement because the actual implementation is at the moment so uneven, hesitant, understaffed, and underfinanced. But inadequacy and incompleteness of concrete implementation do not gainsay the facts that government spokesmen and educational leaders at the highest levels have repeatedly affirmed this commitment and have given evidence, albeit tentative and partial, of their intention to widen and deepen the actual involvement of the society and its resources in the actions relevant to these broad educational goals. Moreover, most of the opposition to the idea that one encounters argues the impracticality or costliness of this commitment, but does not contest the desirability in principle, of equal, quality education for all students.

Because most slogans, including "quality and equality in education", suffer from the easy comfort of ambiguity, we try, in this paper, to translate the diffuse yearnings implied by this attractive phrase into a more precise statement of aims. This, then is a partisan essay which expresses our own preferences for an educational credo that we deem worthy of the promise of American society. We do not pretend that this is a novel effort. Other formulations of educational goals -- such as those by the American Council on Education, by William French and Associates, by Nolan Kearney, and by Benjamin Bloom and his colleagues -- deserve close attention and study, as do the extraordinarily rich works of such classical figures in American education as Horace Mann and John Dewey, to mention two who span the major reaches of time during which the ways and means of the American common school have been debated. If there is any justification for still another set of proposals it lies principally, first, in the extent to which equal weight and importance are given to both equality and quality, and, correlatively, to non-cognitive as well as cognitive aspects of education.

It will be obvious to all who read the conference proceedings how much we have learned from the distinguished educators who were assembled at Princeton.[1] But we do not presume to speak for them. Nor does this essay pretend to be a summary, much less a synthesis, of the conference. We have deliberately chosen, instead, to reprint the seven major papers, the two main critical evaluations of each of these, and the three essays that assess the economic, social, and psychological costs that are entailed in the achievement of equal quality education for all. With the conference proceedings nearly completely on the record we take the liberty of adding some observations of our own.

Our essay addresses itself to the ingredients of quality and equality in education.

The answer to the question of what is equality involves considerations of who shall be educated, for how long, and at what level.

An elaboration of the meaning of equality requires us to set a range of functions we believe the schools must perform if they are to lay proper claim to the term quality education.

We shall also look at some of the principal obstacles, ideological and material, that now stand in the path of achievement of equal quality education as well as at some of the resources, open and covert, that are relevant to these goals.

Who Should be Educated?

We stand on the conviction that every child should have equal access to schooling, and we rest this conviction on the moral premises and functional requirements of a democratic society. These include, in the first instance, the doctrine of equality of opportunity which assumes that there is no warrant in law or tradition in this democratic society for endowing any individual, group, or class with greater initial advantages in seeking the good things of life. Whatever the rationale for the existing inequalities in power, prestige, and possessions, we are unable to find any persuasive philosophical or sociological grounds for denying full equality of opportunity to anyone. Especially if unequal talents and skills lead to unequal outcomes, the starting line should be the same for all. [2]

Free public education is the main instrument of public policy for providing some modicum of equality of opportunity. Equal access to schooling is thus on a par with the right to vote and to enjoy all the public facilities that a society makes available to its citizens. If the opportunities for such participation are unequal -- as, in fact, they are in many cases -- this is evidence that the operations of our institutions need to be corrected rather than that the principle of equal opportunity is invalid.

We are considering here the question of the entitlement of citizens of a democracy to the services provided by their society out of public funds. Few would any longer argue that race or creed or national origins are legitimate bases for allocating different entitlements. There are formal statuses and constitutional interpretations now to confirm the irrelevance of such criteria of distinction. And while there is considerable disagreement as to what constitutes equal education (e.g., can segregated schools be equal?) there is no room any longer in the public debate in education for the question of whether equality as such is proper.

Much more controversial, however, is the doctrine that there is equal entitlement to education regardless of differences in talent and capacities. Indeed, there are many who believe that educational opportunities should be differentially allocated, in accordance with talent and capacity, so that those who are most talented receive the greatest amount. Correlatively, it is considered somewhat whimsical to suggest that those with the least "talent" should get the most education, though the logic of this claim is, on the face of things, just as defensible as that which supports the claim for superior opportunities for the most talented children.

We hold that the idea that "superior" children are entitled to more education is a carry-over from a feudal mode of thought and practice in which differential advantages were the entitlement of the "well born". Today's claim for different entitlement on the basis of talent or capacity is a counterpart of such a doctrine, insofar as it holds that those children who have the good fortune to inherit superior "genes" should also have greater educational opportunities. This doctrine simply substitutes a modern aristocracy of genes for a feudal aristocracy of family.

How Much Education?

The American system of compulsory education generally requires about ten years of schooling. The median years of school completed has increased with every decennial census, and the national average is now in the neighborhood of eleven years. There is considerable attrition in school enrollment, after the tenth year, so that progressively smaller proportions of the school age population are enrolled in school beyond this point. Although well over 90 percent of those eligible to attend the ninth year of school are actually enrolled, only about one-third of college age youth enter the freshman class and perhaps one-half of these "survive" to the senior year. Given these patterns of attrition it seems altogether pertinent to inquire if we are confronted by a desirable and efficient process of selection or by a problem that requires our attention.

Our own answer is that no one is ever well enough educated about anything; that no one ever knows enough to exploit fully the possibilities of his own life or to enrich the lives of his fellows; that no one is ever well enough trained, in his tastes and sensibilities to apprehend the creative achievements of his civilization with sufficient wonder and delight; and further, that no one is ever as aware of himself and of the reaches of his capacities as he could be, nor are the capacities of which he is aware, whether sharply or dimly, ever as fully developed as they might be.

If these assertions are granted, it follows that there are no upper boundaries on the amount of education that anyone "really needs" nor any valid general basis for establishing cut-off points at which schooling should be terminated for any segment of the population. Instead, a lifetime of continuing education becomes an indispensable prerequisite for the good life and effective citizenship.[3] Although the school is by no means the only agency of continuing education, intermittent recourse to some sort of formal instruction is probably unavoidable in any program of personal growth.

Thus, if the proper reply to "Who shall be educated" is "everybody," the unavoidable answer to the query, "For how long?" is "an entire lifetime." These answers are both marvellously simple and incredibly complex, for they are based on the most profound requirements of democratic justice and human need. We are content that there are no goals, imminent or remote, that might better energize the effots of responsible men.

There is irrefutable evidence that there will be many more children in school in years to come than ever before; and that there is going to be an ever-increasing demand to extend school experiences and opportunities by adding both preschool and post-twelfth year schooling for these greater numbers of children. We shall now not argue the merits of the proposed preschool program. But if we are to give any real meaning to the statement that no one ever has enough education, then we cannot help but look with pleasure on the prospect that free public education probably will be extended beyond the twelfth year for more young men and women than the number for whom such advanced education is now available.

What Level of Excellence in Education?

The case for equal high quality education is a simple extension of the principles that have been articulated in the preceding paragraphs. Obviously, if equal access to schooling is desirable, then the equal exposure of all to equally good schooling is even better. The failure to follow this logic converts "parity of opportunity" into meaningless rhetoric. This realization is at the root of many of today's efforts to redress some of the inequities reflected, for example, by the differences in education in the affluent suburbs and the urban slums. A growing consensus now endorses educational excellence for members of all social categories.

Sidney Hook, in discussing Harold Taylor's paper, puts the issue forthrightly when he says:

> "In modern society, intelligent citizenship, without which democracy is a myth, cannot be exercised where leisure is filled with the types of pastimes . . . which are mainly ways of killing time. Intelligent citizenship in a democracy rests ultimately upon the spread of education, because it can serve as a powerful support of political freedom . . . The issue is fundamentally over the desirability and viability of the democratic way of life. If men are in some way to govern themselves as well as others, whether they do it ill or well depends, among other things, on what they come to know through education about the world, society, and themselves." (page 33, Session One)

Professor Hook had previously been considering the likelihood that automation would render obsolete the vocational skills of a large segment of the population and that there would therefore develop an intense need for the kind of education that would enable all men to learn how to participate effectively and with pleasure in the conduct of their lives and in the decisions regarding that conduct. "As democrats", Professor Hook says, "we believe that every child, not only the one starred for excellence, but the one that's not so excellent, has the right to be educated to the full reach of his capacities. If students can significantly profit by some instruction, we have no justification to deprive them of the opportunity of continued schooling." (page 28, Session Seven)

It is incumbent upon us, however, to make more explicit and specific what the content of "quality education" would be in the scheme that we envision. We move in this direction by presenting in the pages to come a series of functions we believe education must serve if it is to be entitled to the name of quality education. It may be noted, in anticipation, that quality education aims not alone at refinement of cognitive capacities, though these are unavoidably part of such education, but at certain crucial psychological and social targets as well. For we believe that our schools must exhibit equal concern for the sensibilities as well as the minds of the students;for their understanding of themselves and their positions in society; and their senses of self-esteem; their capacity to relate easily and amiably to others who differ from them in background or capacity; their ability to manage their normally predictable life tasks and to participate in intelligent reconstruction of their society; and their derivation from their school experiences of a life-long and deep commitment to the value of schooling and to the democratic social institutions which make such education possible.

We deliberately include such a wide and diverse range of educational targets. For it is now well established that the social context importantly affects the ability of the schools to operate in the ways they deem proper and desirable, and the psychological and emotional conditions and openness of the students bear importantly on their ability to develop their cognitive capacities to their fullest. For before any real learning can occur, the student must desire to learn, be willing to do so, be interested, be concerned, and feel confident that he can.

Of paramount importance is the fact that in each of the functions we specify in the pages to come, we specifically intend that the function must be performed equally appropriately for all children. This is another way of saying that an indispensable ingredient of quality education is equality itself. Perhaps the inclusion of equality as a core ingredient of quality is the most distinctive feature of democratic education.

With these requirements in mind, we now offer a set of ten functions which we believe are all equally important and urgent to achieve if genuine quality education is to result. [4]

THE CONSTITUENTS OF QUALITY EDUCATION

1. The School as Vehicle for Transmission of Knowledge and Development of Cognitive Skills

The end product of a quality cognitive education is not information but knowledge. The child does not comprehend himself, or his aesthetic, social, biological and physical worlds, until he is able to convert discrete shreds and patches of data into order and pattern, form and relationship, sequence and transformation. This requires the mastery of the languages of numbers and words in order to proceed with the basic cognitive skills of observation, insight, reason, and the habit of criticism.

These are formidable undertakings but, as Jerome Bruner has repeatedly insisted, it is possible to make even very complex processes intelligible to each child at some meaningful level. He is entitled to be taught rigorously and his "mind stretched" to the outermost limits of his years and capacities.

In point of fact the educational right and left wings have often joined in unwitting conspiracy to deny significant sectors of the population -- the dull middle class, Negroes, Puerto Ricans, rural youth, urban migrants -- the full advantages of serious training in the development of cognitive skills. Elitists disparage the intellects of those groups on the grounds of genetic insufficiency; liberal sentimentalists arrive at the same position because a cruel society has allgedly robbed large numbers of the ability to learn. Children are victimized by condescension whether its source is contempt or pity, for at bottom these are the same. The school is not a benign custodial institution but a house of intellect and none has the mandate to deny large numbers the competence and joy that comes from arduous intellectual effort. If educators have not yet been sufficiently inventive in devising means to reach all children, they will not make the effort if they are falsely persuaded that such attempts must fail.

Though it is not relevant here to propose details of curriculum content, it seems to us clear that the traditional curricular emphases of the schools in America have been inadequate and misplaced in an important degree. There is, for instance, a discernible and unjustifiable difference between the relative sophistication of materials about the natural world that are offered to grade school students, as against those regarding the social world. If the minds of young children are presumably adept enough to grasp the so-called new mathematics and new sciences, they are surely adequate for grasping principles of sociology, anthropology, and economics which would be novel only in the sense that the majority of schools have not yet ventured upon them. It should be no more difficult for a young grade school student to understand some basic principles of social organization and intergroup relations than to learn how to operate with modular number systems.

In the same vein, the tradition of treating music and art as though they were suitable and important for the youngest children, but irrelevant, or, at best, of low priority for the training of older students, seems to us thoroughly unwarranted.

In general, our stand is that the schools have responsibility for helping children to acquire an increasing grasp and deepening understanding of all their important worlds: those of physical nature, social and cultural systems, and humanistic and historical processes and products.

2. The Schools as Agencies of Moral Indoctrination

It is uncontestable that the schools serve as one of the most powerful forces shaping the morals and ethics of the young people of our society. Their influence may be considered benign or evil. But that they are influential, or could be more so is indisputable. To the extent that the schools fail to address themselves to the shaping of values and morals they leave more free room for the impact of other forces, such as the mass media, the peer groups of the students, the families, the churches, and the major cultural themes that are diffused and circulated so quickly and widely in a mass culture such as ours.

This is not to say that unless the schools exercise the influence they have the power to exert, the young men and women will necessarily be that much worse because of the impact of the other forces just named. It is to say, however, that the schools have a mandate to make a moral difference in the lives of our young people. Indeed, we justify our expenditures on education importantly on the supposition that the schools do make an important moral and ethical difference in the lives of our children. We rely on the schools, more than on any other public agency, for the impartation of ideals of democracy and for deepening the commitment of our young people to democratic institutions. In short, we do not at all expect the schools to be morally neutral.

If, from time to time, serious arguments occur in various communities as to which morals and ideals a school ought to be teaching, this only serves to prove that schools are expected to be morally very influential. It is natural, therefore, to be concerned with the content and quality of that influence. So, whatever else we expect the schools to do for and to our children, we do look to them as principal instruments for the recreation in every generation of the commitment to democracy and its institutions. What the schools do, then, matters, and matters a great deal; and when a given school fails to have the extent and kind of impact we hope it to have, we take this as a mark of the shortcoming or failure of the school. In sum, then, the continuity of commitment of the citizens of this society to democracy and democratic social organization depends importantly on how well the schools function.

The opposition to this point of view holds that the schools ought to confine themselves to the training of the minds and the general cognitive functions, and leave the task of moral and ethical training to the families, churches, and other such agencies. But this argument overlooks the fact that the schools function as moral and ethical forces willy nilly. No class can be conducted well, or, for that matter, at all, without the teacher manifesting, commending, and imparting certain standards of right and wrong conduct, good and bad behavior, proper and improper relations. In every class, at every moment, there are at stake such questions as modest vs. immodesty; speed vs. slowness of response; fairness and honesty vs. dishonesty and unfairness; loyalty and disloyalty; greatness and mediocrity in human achievement; proper and improper aspirations for success; good conduct and bad conduct in group situations; consideration for others or lack of it. Each of these issues is implied or explicit in some constantly recurring part of the conduct of social relations in the classroom, the content of the curriculum, and the expected standards of school performance.

To say, then, that the schools ought to confine themselves to training cognitive skills is to ignore the very complex network of emotional and psychological forces which are constantly being brought to bear in every classroom in support of certain sets of ethical and moral codes of conduct over others. Explicit recognition ought to be given to the fact that the classroom is a communication network and that, therefore, there ought to be explicit and serious concern for the moral and ethical messages that are being conveyed.

3. The School as Agency of Social Change

Of all the publicly supported institutions of our society, the schools, by the very nature of their franchise and mandate, are most suited for attuning our young men and women for life in a rapidly changing world -- one that changes both in the direction of its moral involvements and in the knowledge and skills requisite to successful management of life necessities and general societal goals. No other institution has such a deeply vested, albeit nominal, interest in the exercise of critical reflection and in the adjustment of the very basic modes of its conduct to new trends in civilization.[5] If a family chooses to stand on a tradition established by a remote ancestor, that is its option. If a corporation insists on maintaining certain principles of operation that are outmoded, the probable loss is, in theory, sustained only by the corporation, and it is not our official public concern. If churches persist in adhering to creeds and doctrines appropriate only to other centuries, that is their right, however much we may dislike those doctrines. But if schools do not constantly adjust and readjust their curricula, methods, and administrative organizations to accommodate new developments in politics, science, art, morality, and international relations, then we hold this to be a matter of public concern requiring our attention.

A second requirement upon the schools if they are to serve as effective agents of social change is to cultivate in the students from the earliest years on the habits and skills of effective social criticism. Such critical skills, we feel, must be exercised as much upon the operations of the deficiencies of the interests of our own society as upon those of competing social systems. Our democracy will be stronger, we feel, proportionately to the extent to which it is open and sensitive to continuous critical inquiry and the attendant reconstruction of its definitive structures and functions.

4. The School as Preparation for Vocation

In this society, we are virtually all agreed that the schools must function to prepare our children for the adult world of work. Some may prefer the strategy of protracted liberal arts training that emphasizes sufficient breadth and flexibility for unpredictable vocational demands. Other advocate early and deep immersion in concrete training to develop specific vocational skills. But whatever the sequence of steps and the nature of training considered proper, virtually all concur that the schools must serve the very practical end of preparation of young men and women for their adult occupational roles. No other public agency, and few families are as well equipped to undertake this task.

The capacity of our society and economy to grow and thus to provide increasingly higher standards of living, or even to maintain a fair standard of living for an increasing population, depends, among other critical factors, on the efficient use of available manpower. Minimum efficiency requires the minimization both of unemployment and under-employment. If significant proportions of the work force are not utilized to their full potentialities, the total potential of the economy is correspondingly reduced. Education for vocational skills is thus an indispensable ingredient of a productive society. We have come increasingly to recognize this, especially as regards the most unemployed and underemployed sectors of our society, namely, the Negro population. We have come to understand, too, in what ways it is appropriate to speak of our society as relatively underdeveloped, mainly because of the failure to train and utilize existing manpower potential at its highest levels of possibilities. And, in turn, we have come to see why equal education for all our young men and women is indispensable if we are to provide the manpower for the mainsprings of our productive capacity.

5. The School as Adventure in Tastes and Sensibilities

Professor David Daiches, a noted British literary critic, and now a leading figure at the experimental University of Sussex, once said (if a paraphrase be permitted) -- that the difference between education in England and in the United States is that American schools focus on teaching their children how to make money while the British schools instruct their children how to spend it. [6] This contrast is surely overdrawn but it will serve to point up what is meant here when it is said that one of the major tasks of education is to refine the sensibilities and tastes of our young men and women. The school must expose its students to those experiences that will enable them to appreciate and enjoy -- and perhaps even create -- those finest expressions of the human spirit of this civilization and others, present and past, that go under the generic name of culture.

Once again, it is important to note that only a minority of families are competent to deal with this task; and other public agencies such as museums lack a sufficient mass base to perform this assignment adequately. The schools are probably the only instrumentalities that are potentially capable of stimulating millions of people to seek the ideals of Greek citizenship described by Professor Hook -- "the pursuit and enjoyment of ends, of consummatory experiences . . . active citizenship, not earning a living."

7. The School as Source of Equal Self-Esteem

The bases of self-esteem vary from society to society. Our culture has shaped our consciousness so that "self-esteem" depends heavily on "social standing", and standing, in turn, depends importantly upon some combination of one's occupation, education, and income, with multipliers and dividers in the form of religious, national, and racial memberships. Since social standing is unequally distributed, so too, is self-esteem. Our system of stratification thus distributes not only life chances and styles but the very ingredients of self images. It seems unavoidable, therefore, that publicly-symbolized marks of success or failure shall be internalized as enhancement or deflation of self-worth. It is even true, as we know from a number of studies, that unemployed individuals, even during periods of depression tend to blame themselves for their inability to find jobs, even though they know that in general they are like millions of others in this regard.

The school may counteract these cultural themes and help build self-esteem in two principal ways: (1) by enlarging the student's understanding of the impersonal sources of "failure", and (2) by conveying to each pupil its equal concern for his development and welfare.

It is important for students of all social strata to recognize the extent to which the "luck of the draw" or "accident of birth" gives some young people very decided advantages over others in crucial aspects of their social fates. The perception that the social environment provides resources and sets limits upon possible achievements discourages the self-congratulation of the advantaged and is one of the few possible sources of redemption from the burden of personal guilt that we are encouraged to assume for many of our shortcomings. Moreover, a realistic understanding of the actual operation of society would make it possible for young people to focus both on inequitable features of society as well as its main strengths. Thus prepared, they might become instruments for beneficent social change.

In the classroom the school can make a more immediate and direct contribution to the self-esteem of all students by treating each of them as equally worthy regardless of the social standing of his family, his skin color, ethnic origins, religion, and regardless of his academic performance. It is here that the intersection of quality and quality in education is most clear. Nowhere else-not on the street, nor among peers, nor on the job, nor in neighborhoods, nor in churches or voluntary associations, nor in the messages of the mass media -- is it easy to escape continued reminders of one's relative standing as compared to others. The school could thus serve as a kind of armor and insulation for the self-esteem of the otherwise socially devalued and denigrated child. In so doing, they also contribute to the maintenance of morale and motivation _vis a vis_ academic performance, and to the maintenance of commitment to this society's norms of good conduct, in much the same way as they provide chances for social and economic mobility. It is difficult to think of a greater threat to a social system than the existence of a large stratum who,from the earliest years, have been spurned as pariahs by all of society's institutions.

8. The School as Source of Self-Knowledge

It all too frequently proves to be the case in life that we get vague hints and intimations of other lives we might be leading, of other skills we might be employing, of other pleasures we might be indulging, of other dimensions of our being that we might be experiencing. But we feel locked in by our commitments -- to ourselves, to our families, to our proprieties, to our desires for security. And we do not feel the freedom to explore other sources of meaning. Adult life makes comparatively little provision for such free exploration.

But the best conception of the role of education for young people is precisely to enable them to engage in continuous self-exploration and discovery; to come to know who and what they are and could be; to find out what limits are imposed on them and what new reaches toward experience they might dare attempt. The continuous expansion of self-knowledge, and of the numerous ways in which one can relate himself to the world of objects, persons and tasks, is surely one of the most benign outcomes one might wish to achieve through education in a democracy.

Again, no other agency, except on occasion the family, has either the skills or the resources or the explicit mandate to make such self-exploration possible. If it is true, as Julian Huxley once put it, that most human beings operate at about five percent of their potential, then we can look only or mainly to the school to make it possible to expand and increase the human potential in each of our children that will be brought into socially effective and personally pleasurable operation. Intelligent choice of a way of life that one can endorse for himself surely requires, among other things, a sound knowledge of the possibilities that one has in him. The schools are the main sources from which the child can secure this knowledge of available choices before adult responsibility drastically restricts his options.

9. The School as Training for Cultural Pluralism

The school has a special role in habituating young people to a peaceful and productive cultural pluralism. We refer to the fact that there exist in our population diverse nationality, religious, racial and class groups, and more problematic, perhaps, than any other, there are great ranges of difference in natural capacities, whether for musical, artistic, intellectual, or athletic performances. It is important to note that the "common school" was intended deliberately to deal even-handedly with all the diverse children who came to it; that the ways in which the schools manage diversity often reflect and sometimes guide the general community in its management of the relations among diverse peoples; that, further, the models of relationship practiced by the teacher and urged upon the students in the classroom often can have serious impact on how the children will relate to each other outside the classroom; and, finally, both law and custom charge the teacher with conducting the business of education as though racial, religious, nationality, ethnic and other diversities were irrelevant. None of these group identities which the child brings with him are to be allowed to become part of his effective school identity in any way that might interfere with his securing equal and equally appropriate relationships with his teachers and the curriculum.

A major task of the school, then, is the training of our children for living peacefully and productively with their fellow citizens, whatever their differences in background and ability. In this fashion the school contributes to the preparation of children for life in a culturally pluralist society.

10. The School as Agent of Physical and Mental Health

The diversities of class and culture that children bring into the school result in differences in physical health, psychological well-being, cleanliness, and habits of adequate diet and rest, not to mention the differences in privacy, intellectual support, actual assistance with homework, conditions of lighting and quiet, and freedom from the necessity of performing chores or gainful work. All of these differences contribute in some degree to differences in motivation, aspiration, ability, attention which, in turn, are highly relevant, as we know, to differential school success. There have recently emerged a number of curricular programs such as those that are designed to provide quiet, well-lit study places for children whose homes do not make such conditions possible, and tutorial services for the benefit of lower class children, whose parents cannot assist them, to perform their school work more adequately. As yet, most such programs are not part of official school management. But it has been traditional for the schools officially to be concerned with the physical well-being of the child, and his habits of diet and rest, and, in more recent years, this definition of function has been expanded to include the detection, screening, and referral for treatment of incipient or actual problems of mental health.

In taking an active hand in such matters, the school is, in effect, serving as an equalizing agency, one designed to compensate for the disabilities that are incurred by certain classes of children because of the disadvantaged social and economic and educational backgrounds of their families. The word "compensate" is crucial here, for it evokes our awareness of a current and heated debate regarding the propriety of "compensatory education", or academic assistance provided to children from disadvantaged families, in the form of programs popularly known as Higher Horizons and Operation Headstart. That the schools shall engage in some compensatory activities, officially and resourcefully, and with special personnel (e.g. guidance officers) is now widely accepted. The debate centers on the range and scope of such activities and on their costs relative to other school functions.

The best view of such compensatory activities views them as mechanisms that help children overcome, at least in part, disadvantages which are not of their making. This assistance permits them to approach equality with others in their ability to benefit from academic experiences. These programs also reflect the functional concern of the school for the physical and mental well-being of each child and society's interest in the health of its citizens.

*** *** ***

In the formulation of the goals just stated, we have taken account not only of what a democratic society in general requires of its schools, but what this society, in particular, requires, with its racial, ethnic, and religious diversity and particularly its unequal distribution of life chances and styles.

Despite our sensitivity to the character of existing social arrangements our proposals are deliberately "unreal" in at least two respects; in the obvious sense that as with all ideals they cannot be achieved either fully or immediately, and, secondly, in their implication that schools should exist as islands of virtue in the midst of an imperfect nation. We are persuaded that it is essential for the growth and development of a democratic society that the schools should not operate on the same principles as the marketplace of status, or as a corporation, or as a miniscule reflection of the community as it is. Rather, we hold the schools ought to be conducted in terms as closely approximating what ideally we say our whole society should be -- equal, fair, just, non-discriminatory, unprejudiced, morally righteous, open, creative, critically reflective, encouraging spontaneity and commitment -- all the terms are familiar, and represent what we should like our lives to be, if we could have the best terms possible.

It is only as the schools strain toward the "ideal" that they can avoid being nothing more than pale reflections of the "actual" world. And only as they seek the ideal do they prepare students effectively for active participation in the kinds of social change required to undo the injustices built into our actual institutions and to create and give enduring roots to institutions that more closely approximate the forms and functions of democratic society.

OBSTACLES AND RESOURCES IN THE PURSUIT OF QUALITY AND EQUALITY IN EDUCATION

We conceive of the American school system as dedicated to the equal education of all young men and women, at the highest level of excellence our resources will make possible, and for as long a period as seems necessary for the achievement of the goals of quality education, recognizing always the limits imposed by our social resources and those of the variable desires, interests, and abilities of the population to be educated.

The achievement of these goals entails social, psychological and economic costs that must be borne by society at large. These have been capably analyzed by Professors Williams, Bronfenbrenner, and Harris. Here we confine ourselves more narrowly to selected problems that are located within the educational sector, including (1) ideological or valuational difficulties, and (2) problems of educational process and method.

1. Ideological and Value Obstacles

The defense of unequal education takes many forms. One version implicitly questions the entitlement of all persons to the best of society's resources. In its mild form this view assumes that those who are most able to benefit from social rewards deserve them. A more extreme extension of this argument postulates a natural order of superior and inferior human beings, some of whom "rate" a greater share of the world's goods and services. A familiar illustration of this approach is found among those who would deny first-class citizenship to Negroes and other minority groups.

A second source of opposition to the egalitarian credo rests on the presumed dysfunctions associated with quality education for all. Thus Ernest van den Haag, in commenting on

Dr. Powell's paper on adult education states ". . . no one at all in this conference has talked about the possible undesirable effects of using more resources for education . . . For instance, one may foster ambition more than one fosters the capacity to fill it. This certainly leads not only to unhappiness but to very grave social consequences. One may, by means of more education, lead to more homogenization. One may, further, destroy family bonds that may have some value. One may foster the tendency that the family now has to place responsibility on institutions such as the school, that cannot possibly bear that responsibility."

A kindred point of view is impressed with the range of differences among youth, and with the observable fact that many among school-age youth have no interest in school, would obviously prefer to be elsewhere, and in any event will probably pursue occupations, and lead lives which it is claimed can make no use of academic instruction up to and especially beyond the twelfth year. This mode of thought tends to take for granted either that the differences among youth as they now emerge are fair reflections of their natural abilities, or that significant reduction in the present range of differences would entail too much cost. A logical extension of this line of reasoning is that scarcity of talent requires the schools to assign its highest priorities to the training of potential leaders.

The most persuasive arguments against the full implementation of equal, quality education are advanced by those who assert the claims of the "national interest" against all other considerations. This orientation is informed by the requirements of cold war and intimations of hot war. Its proponents are especially sensitive to the need for a sophisticated technology that can only be developed by investing disproportionate amounts of our educational resources on training the youth who are talented in science, mathematics, and in allied applied disciplines such as engineering.

This argument is, in principle, defensible; crises may always arise that require short-run departures from democratic practices. Fourteen million men in the armed services temporarily relinquished their civil liberties as part of the necessary price required to subdue Nazi Germany. However, such responses are justified only in the presence of a clear and imminent danger to a paramount national interest that takes precedence over others.

The demands of national security do not now seem to require any crash efforts in the field of science. Indeed, there is considerable doubt that the United States has ever lacked sufficient scientific and technical personnel in the area of defense. The grizzly word "overkill" summarizes our capacity to retaliate against any conceivable enemy. Similarly, the space program has had recourse to an abundance of talent and even if this were not the case the prestige of making the first moon landing would not, in our judgment, justify any retreat from the principle that all children are entitled to an equally good education.

The most vigorous opponents of equal education are the large number of people in our society who, finding themselves and their children in relatively advantaged positions, and fearing that social change may lessen these advantages, argue against any educational measures that they feel might impair the educational and vocational careers of their children. These people are ordinarily willing to grant that all people theoretically have the right to seek scarce rewards and privileges. But they do not wish existing resources to be reallocated and current arrangements to be changed to make the common pursuit of those ends more possible. Any opportunities that are to be given to new claimants must somehow come out of new resources, without significantly altering the advantages now enjoyed by their children.

This last point of view brings to the fore the relevance of a distinction between two very separate educational orientations. One focusses on the "educational policies needed by a community or society for all its children", while the other is primarily concerned with the effective management of the educational career of one's individual children.

It is understandable that individual parents should seek to maximize the best interests of their children. But demands made in terms of these criteria may not be consonant with what any society must do if it is to maximize the educational opportunities and experiences of all of its children. Those who are responsible for educational policy are obliged by their public mandate to deny special treatment to any particular group of children, if providing such treatment requires that the quality education of substantial numbers of others will be adversely affected. Thus, the demand for special privileges for the gifted should not be equated with quality education. Every child, whatever the level of his academic talent, has special needs, as special as those of any other.

This conflict between the careers of particular children and normal needs of all children is at the root of much of the controversy that has arisen about the proper conduct of the schools. But we may not ignore the possibility -- one which we shall later explore -- that many of the programs, such as ability grouping, that many believe are advantageous for talented children, may not be desirable at all, when all relevant values are considered. Such findings may be useful in demonstrating that much of the conflict between parents and school authorities to which we have become accustomed in racially mixed or economically heterogeneous communities may be unnecessary.

One may not be overly sanguine, however, about the prospects of reducing the influence of those who for one reason or another opt for unequal education for various kinds of children. In the first place, many in this category are among the best educated and most advantageously situated members of the community. They tend to be among the most informed and the most politically active, and to dominate PTA's and Boards of Education. For these reasons, among others, they tend to exercise influence far beyond their number.

Secondly, it is difficult to overestimate the importance that many people attach to the sequence of academic excellence, success in higher education, and the subsequent pursuit of a prestigious career. Nor are superintendents, principals and teachers noticeably different from the rest of the population in the extent to which they share these goals. Accordingly, both school and parents tend to measure the "quality" of a school by the proportion of the children who exceed national norms on various ability tests, enter college, secure outstanding scholarships, or, in a very refined twist, enroll in universities that have Phi Beta Kappa chapters.

The emphasis upon such criteria of "quality" reaches its zenith in prosperous suburban communities with a high percentage of college-educated parents. The overweening emphasis on preparing students for admission to college is probably less damaging in such localities because so few fail to pursue some form of higher education. But it is obvious that even in these communities there are wide ranges of abilities among the students and serious discrepancies in the prestige ratings, and hence the "acceptability" of the different colleges to which they apply. Above all, the ideas of learning for its own sake and education for creative personal growth, good citizenship, mental health, and the conduct of a meaningful life, tend to be as much subverted in these "college-bound" communities as in those where the percentage who go on to college is significantly smaller.

If the quality of schools is measured by the percent of students who make "distinguished" academic records, earn scholarships, enter college, and the like, then several things naturally follow. In the first instance, superintendents, principals, and teachers vie with each other in plotting academic success stories and structure the operations of their schools so as to maximize the boast-worthy achievements of their elites. There naturally follows an attrition in the amount of attention paid to the development of other children.[7] For, the growth of a less able child to higher levels of ability or performance cannot possibly command much attention or pride or interest when the main focus of the school is on the preparation of the academically talented for prestigious college admission.[8]

The identification of "quality education" with the welfare of the elite is striking evidence both of the disproportionate influence which high-status parents have been able to exert on the public school system of the United States and of the inherent power of the cultural values of "success" and "distinction." It is also remarkable that both the reality and the conception of "elite," an idea that has value, if any at all, only for a very small portion of the school population, should be able to achieve such power and influence in a society that specifically denies, in its most general commitment and official basic documents, the legitimacy of such special claims.[9] Here, then, we see one of the fundamental social conflicts in our society being acted out in a major agency of public policy, the public school system.

Against the idea of special entitlement and interests in the outcomes of an elite, we propose a very simple contrary idea -- namely, that the schools of the United States should be operated for the equal benefit of all children. Therefore, the development of each child, at whatever level of talent or accomplishment, must be a matter of equal concern and attention of the schools and all their agents. Against a standard that measures the quality of schools by elite accomplishment, therefore, we offer the countervailing notion that the school is most succesful which makes it possible for every child to realize, to the maximum, the valuable potentials in himself.[10]

There are those who respond to this egalitarian credo by invoking the word "standards", claiming that standards are debased when the "egalitarian" approach is taken. But this position confuses standards with norms. If children have diverse natural abilities, then we must expect diverse accomplishments. The highest possible standard any school can hope to achieve, therefore, is to maximize the development of every child, within the range of his capacities. Thus, the extent to which a school makes this possible for all children is a measure of the extent to which it has maintained high standards of education. To define standards otherwise is to impose upon a widely variable population a uniform and, therefore, unfair, ill-fitting set of expectations.

In the same vein, it is sometimes argued that we debase the meaning of a high school diploma or of college admission by allowing so many persons who are not really "college material" to get such diplomas and to enter college. But this claim, too, arises from an anachronistic notion of the meaning of a high school diploma, one that was developed under very different conditions of social organization, and when the school population was utterly different in character. There need be little problem with this issue if we take as our stand that we are committed, at the minimum, to the free public education of all our children, for a period of at least twelve years, and that we do the best we can for all children within these twelve years. At the end of twelve years, we certify that they have attended school for twelve years, and we provide, if need be, certain estimates of what they know about various subjects and what kind of people they have become: what are their attitudes, their social relations, their apparent interests and motivations.

We get mired in problems here only if we say there are certain specific uniform levels of knowledge and ability that every study who has been in school twelve years must achieve. What should those levels be? How can we set identical levels of expectation for all students, when we recognize the great diversities in their motivation and abilities? No matter what devices we employ, some students will simply learn much more than others in any given period of time, and certain students will have become very different kinds of people, in their orientations to themselves, their schools and their societies. We cannot avoid recognizing this range of abilities and hence altering our rather rigid traditional notions of the meaning of a high school diploma.

The same considerations apply to the question of admission to higher education. Again, our problems arise here because we attach a tradition-bound meaning to the term "college". We think in terms of a very special level of brightness and ability a notion that is a legacy from an era when but the tiniest fraction of students went beyond high school. But this traditional meaning is utterly unrealistic in the modern period. If we have any belief at all in the value of continuing education, then, when a student finishes twelve years, and if he desires to continue for a thirteenth or fourteenth year, and if we have the resources, we are obliged to provide this additional time for him. If we do not have the resources to provide the thirteenth and fourteenth and more years still for all those who desire them, then we face the problem of selecting who shall go on. At that point, some may advocate that only those should be chosen who have learned the most in the first twelve years. Others, however, might sensibly argue that the best use of our scarce resources would be to give preferential admission to advanced education to those who had learned the least in the previous twelve years, simply on the grounds that they obviously need the additional education more than others. Still other arguments at this point might invoke the national interest. But we would surely avoid many of the present difficulties if we conceived of the education as a process that is designed to do the most for each child in the years that public funds make it possible. Whatever is achieved, is achieved. And if this conception creates difficulties for the admission directors of existing institutions of higher education, so be it; elementary and high schools know purposes more noble than acting primarily as training and recruiting agencies for an elite of college-bound students. To say that we thereby debase the meaning of college education is to accept a very ill-fitting, antiquated, elitist notion of who is entitled to how much education, and of what education beyond the twelfth year necessarily implies.

We are advancing notions here that are similar to those put forth by Martin Trow in his discussion of Peter Rossi's paper. Trow refers us to Crossland's distinction between weak and strong versions of the doctrine of equality. The former refers to the program that urges equal opportunity for all, but expects differential outcomes on the basis of native differences in capacities and early sorts students into different groups on the basis of these differences. By contrast, the strong version of equality sees intelligence as being created by the schools, and hence looks forward to much more intense intervention by the schools in all those aspects of a student's life -- his family, his motivation, and the like -- which are deemed relevant to his ability to succeed in school. Thus, prolonged education is advocated for all children under the strong doctrine of equality, rather than the early sorting out sponsored under the weak version of equality. It was in line with this strong doctrine that England recently developed the system of free, comprehensive secondary schools, in the belief that, as Trow puts it, "the longer educational doors remain open, the less selective are institutions, presumably the more attenuated are the influences or the handicaps of lower-class birth." And Trow calls our attention to the fact that our own development of the two-year or junior colleges, with virtually automatic admission, in a number of places, for any high school graduate, is an extension of the doctrine that the longer the education, the greater the reduction in differences due to the unequal advantages children inherit from the status of their parents.

Our own notion here is akin to the strong version of equality, but also differs from it, in that while we see prolonged schooling as helping to overcome some of the impairments of ability due to unequal environment, we would not rest the argument for prolonged education alone or primarily on this basis. Rather, we see the primary justification of prolonged, equal education for all as resting upon a philosophical commitment to the equal right of all children to such advanced education, and upon the fact of the utility for all children, given our educational goals, of as much education as they and we can manage effectively. By utility we refer simply to the fact that every person can profit from continuing to learn more about himself, his society, and his world, and from continuing to train his capacities for critical thought and for the enjoyment of the cultural products of the world. It is, of course, eminently probable that many persons simply may not want, or even may despise, the idea of any further education, beyond a certain limited point. But this has nothing to do with their right to such education, if they come to desire it, nor with their ability to profit from it, under altered circumstances of desire and motivation.

How then does one meet and overcome the obstacles presented by parents and teachers and superintendents whose ideologies of education are at variance with the notions of equal, quality education presented here? No simple panacea can be offered. But it must be said straightforwardly that this is both a political problem, that is, one of power, and a problem of re-education.

Under conditions of local control of school affairs, nothing can easily be done in a community where the leading citizens and official agents of the school confine their interests, activities, and community resources to the special cultivation of elite excellence. One must look in such cases to counter-organization of dissatisfied parents and teachers, aided perhaps by pressure from Federal and State Boards of Educational authorities, who may, from a more disinterested perspective, find it possible to respond sympathetically to the needs of all children.

The issue is less difficult to meet in urban areas with their usual admixture of very variable levels of student talent and interest, and cultural and religious backgrounds. The advantage lies at the outset with those parents, teachers, and administrators who are committed to the doctrine of equal, quality education for all, principally because that doctrine is easier to defend publicly, and enjoys more support in the professional educational literature than the elitist orientation. Much depends, therefore, in such communities on the extent to which educational agencies insist on performing their roles in conformity with their public mandates, fending off demands or appeals for special treatment of elite students by referring patiently but forcefully to their obligations to all students.

Moreover, the massive intervention in school financing that the federal government is now beginning comes down rather firmly on the side of those favoring equal, quality education for all. It would be altogether proper if this infusion of federal financing were to be accompanied by regulations that guaranteed that the funds would be used to implement equal quality education for all.

These suggestions involve the use of power -- legitimate power of one's formal position and the power that goes with control of finances -- to move closer to the desired goals. The attack through re-education involves principally two sets of publics: the parents, and the teacher-administrative staffs.

Parental re-education can take place (without now saying how effectively) through PTA's, adult education courses, parent-principal and parent-teacher conferences, and through the mass media. Re-education of teachers and administrators must count heavily on in-service training courses and workshops, and on the earlier education in the degree-granting institutions which teachers and administrators attend. If the results thus far have not been very happy, this must be taken as grounds for renewed effort rather than for discouragement and resignation.[11]

For the movement toward equal quality education is unmistakeably underway, and it will not be surprising to discover, if adequate research is done on the question, that the majority of institutions that train teachers and principals and superintendents do in fact place very great emphasis on equal, quality education for all. Whether the teachers, principals and superintendents will, on their jobs, be able to resist the pressures to function in service of unequal education, depends, in some measure, on their personal courage and dedication, but in large measure on the degree of support they receive from more powerful sources at the local, state, and federal levels.

2. Obstacles Arising out of Educational Process and Methods

A full inventory of these problems is impossible here. Let us therefore point only to a selected few, and concentrate especially upon those which are amenable to immediate treatment, without the massive infusion of new resources for the school.

We focus our attention on that approach to education that is implied in the word "individuation." The meaning of this term is reasonably clear. A teacher individuates his education by establishing the kind of relationship with each child that makes it possible for the teacher to know each child as an individual; to know at least some of the relevant aspects of his background, his personality, and his problems; to have some fair estimate of the ranges of his capacities and desires; and to be sensitive to his variable moods and inclinations. The more of this knowledge the teacher has, the more possible it is for him to adapt his own style, the curriculum, and the organization of the classroom and its conduct to the variable needs, capacities, and interests of the students in the class. Only as such individuated education is approximated is it possible to say one is approximating equality in education. For that is just what equality means: the provision of the education most appropriate to each child, where appropriate refers to the individual needs, capacities, and interests. A simple model of this approach would be the well-ordered family, where each child's unique makeup is understood and appreciated by the parents, and where the conduct of the home, and the relationships of parents to children, are attuned to these insights and understandings.

Objections may well be raised immediately to suggesting the well-ordered family as a model of a classroom, if only because the ratio of adult to child is so very different. It is undeniably true that what is possible when there are two parents and three or four children, is simply not possible when there is one teacher and thirty children.

One may readily grant the disparate possibilities due to the different numbers of people involved. However, it is the style of the relationship between adult and child of which we are speaking. A classroom will benefit to the extent that the teacher strives to achieve with each of her students some of the same kind of unique relationship that some parents achieve in their homes. And a home will suffer, we argue, to the extent that parents deal with their children as they would be dealt with in a badly run classroom, namely, where there is no effort made to relate to each child with as much individuality as is possible within the limits of time and energy.

We advance this home-model of individuated relationships, recognizing the limitations of numbers, in order to highlight the question of what is it that teachers do not now do that they could do, or what is it that they now do that they could refrain from doing, that would make more individuated relationships possible? For it is through individuation, we reiterate, that we approach equality.

We see three major forms of school process and conduct that are now prevalent that constitute serious impediments to individuation and hence to equality and that, in our judgment, could be effectively minimized without significant addition of new resources.

1. Obstacles Arising from Stereotyping

We refer here to the widespread tendency to categorize pupils into major clusters or types, and to respond to these clusters in terms of certain assumed common characteristics of all so classified. Among the leading stereotypes are those which refer to the racial group of the child, the socio-economic class of his parents, and the label of his native ability. If pupils are seen primarily as Negro or white, they are not seen as individuals. If they are perceived primarily as lower or middle or upper class, they are not seen as individuals. If they are viewed primarily as fast or slow, smart or stupid by nature, their individual, variable profiles of capacity, over time, and for various kinds of performances simply cannot emerge clearly and be utilized sensitively.

Significant reduction in the amount of stereotyping of pupils is strictly within the capacity of the teachers and schools as they are now constituted. Teachers can be and must be impressed with the uselessness and indeed with the harm of employing such categories in their relationships to students.

One may be, and indeed must be, aware of those social and personal characteristics of children that are relevant to how they feel about themselves, how they perceive the world, and what resources they have at their command. But to be aware of these limits and resources of children is one thing; to make them the primary terms of identity in the teaching situation is quite another.

These matters are not strange or novel to teachers. Sufficient years of experience with coeducation of boys and girls, for instance, has accustomed teachers to relate to boys and girls with an awareness of some of their culturally and biologically conditioned differences, without making invidious distinctions between them. At least, let us say, the categorization by sex, even though it tends to be full of stereotypes and half-truths about the differences between boys and girls, stands much less in the way of effective individuation of relationships than do the categories of race, class, and intelligence. We cite this example of boy-girl categories only to show that one can be aware of differences, and even believe the range of popular stereotypes, without necessarily impairing one's effectiveness in dealing with members of the stereotyped categories as unique individuals.

That teachers should be sensitive to the categories of race, class, and intelligence is quite natural in a culture such as ours that promotes these categorical awarenesses in a thousand different obvious and subtle ways. But here a distinction must be drawn between private beliefs and passions, on the one hand, and public policies, on the other. No teaching can be effective if the public classroom policy is simply a macroscopic re-enactment of the private feelings of the teacher. The absorption of this principle is the essence of responsible professionalism.

2. Obstacles Arising from Testing and Ability Grouping

Teachers are facilitated, perhaps unwittingly, perhaps purposely at times, in their tendency to stereotype students and to cluster them for mass treatment, by the endless round of testing of "abilities" and "achievements" that the schools sponsor and demand. Ability tests and instruments that measure I.Q.'s are equally culpable in this respect. It is becoming increasingly evident, as Samuel Kirk and Miriam Goldberg have so eloquently pointed out in their papers for this conference, that the use of tests to put students into different ability groups is not only of dubious value but may indeed be altogether harmful to the goal of providing the most appropriate education for each child. For there is considerable variability, not only within so-called homogeneous groups, but within each child: at any given moment, over the range of different kinds of tasks he is asked to perform and over time for any single task itself. Assigning children to set levels of ability thus deflects the teacher's attention from both the intra-group and intro-student variability. The possibilities of individuation, and in turn of equality and quality education, are thus considerably attenuated, and unnecessarily so.[12]

It is ironic that homogeneous ability groupings were instituted primarily with the intention of making it possible to approach individuation somewhat more closely. For their net effect, as research studies are beginning increasingly to show, is to lock students up in categories out of which they almost never move. No school on record is able to claim that as many as ten per cent of its students assigned to ability groups at the seventh or eighth grade levels move either up or down out of the groups of their original assignment. Knowing what we now do about the imperfections in testing and about the phenomena of "late blooming" and "early fading", it is little short of miraculous that assignments on the basis of imperfect tests and teacher judgments should be so accurate as to be preserved 90 per cent or better intact over a span of six or seven years of schooling. In fact, of course, original assignments tend to persist principally because, by the operations of the self-confirming hypothesis, children are fashioned to conform to the original test-definitions imposed upon them. It is reasonable to suppose that assignment of children to groups other than the most favored tends to demoralize them, thereby further "confirming" the validity of the initial assignment.

The researches of Kirk, Goldberg, Passow, and others have indicated that it is not possible to discover any constant, regular, and predictable gain in any of the ability-levels when they are divided into homogeneous groups. At the same time, it is quite evident to all teachers involved in these procedures that every child knows whether he is in the "slow" or "fast" group. These groups become the basis of anti-democratic snobberies and invidious distinctions. The schools may be principally blamed for instituting and abetting these attitudes by public symbolization, through formal grouping, of the presumed differences in the capacities of the students. Since the school's degree of concern and regard for a child are expressed in the realm of publicly symbolized academic distinctions, ability groups serve also to prove to lower-ranked children that in the eyes of the school they are indeed unequal.

These considerations suggest that the segregation of entire classes on the basis of native intelligence or academic achievement is incompatible with any reasonable definition of quality and equality in education. The temporary intra-classroom grouping of children for specific purposes is a more troublesome matter. There are obvious advantages to a harrassed teacher confronted by many children if she can organize them into "homogeneous" smaller groups on the basis of their specific competencies in such subjects as physical science and mathematics. This procedure has the effect of reducing the size of the class so to speak while still retaining some measure of individuation. There should be shifting composition of such groups that recognizes the different relative standing of children in varied contexts and every opportunity should be made to provide each with the experience of achieving some success. These purely mechanical and contrived mechanisms are of course no substitute for a teacher who is sensitive to the danger that a temporary convenience of classroom management may be interpreted by her pupils as a moral judgment.

At the same time in many instances, perhaps most, "heterogeneous" grouping may be a positive asset to instruction. The social studies and literature are enriched when they are approached from the widest possible range of perspectives. Children from varied environments with diverse interior lives may well educate each other and add still another source of vicarious experience to their fellows. Talented middle class children, for example, would be beneficiaries if they discovered from their less favored peers that there is more to heaven and earth than had been dreamt of in their parochial lives.

The weight of the argument against "tracking" is so strong that at the very least schools have the obligation to re-examine their practices. They might elect to evaluate the effect of deferring grouping until much later in the academic career; or, more appropriate yet, to conduct ungrouped schools, except for experimental try-outs of various forms of grouping with very selected samples of the school population.

3. Obstacles Arising from Competitive Marking and Promotion and Failure.

The third major obstacle in the path of individuation, and hence of equal quality education for all children, lies in the system of competitive marking of students each month or thereabouts, and in the policy of promoting or failing students at the end of each term or year. It is our contention that assigning grades, such as A, B, and C, or 100, 90, 80, etc. is both meaningless and harmful to sound education that presumes to be both equal and at a level of high quality for all children. Our reasoning once again follows out of the concept of individuation. There is no sensible meaning one can give to a grade of B or C except as one implies that there are some unifrom standards of achievement that one expects from all students and that students must be informed periodically how far short of these standards they have fallen. Such an approach obviously denies our awareness of the range of variable abilities presented to us in any normal classroom.

The alternative we suggest is as follows: If we have a curriculum before us, and a certain set of materials we should like our students to learn, to the extent of their capacities and ours, then we do the best we can with each child. At any given point in time, we know, and the students know, how much they have learned and how much they can do. At the next moment in time, we and they try to increase and augment their knowledge and abilities. And we do this for the twelve years that we are together.

Nowhere in this process is there any relevance at all that we can see for the concept of failure or success, and the symbols of those terms epitomized in A, B, C, F, etc. Students learn as much as they and we can manage to make it possible for them to learn. This is neither success or failure. This is not A nor B nor F work -- except as we impose artificial, meaningless, uniform standards upon a widely variable school population.

By the terms of our suggestions here a student does not go on to more difficult materials until he has mastered less difficult or complex materials -- *assuming we are sure he ought to be learning these materials in the first place*. But no one, by our lights, should go on to a new set of materials because he has managed to master 60 or 70 per cent of the previous level. Such "promotion" only guarantees cumulative failure.

The system of competitive marks is ordinarily defended as necessary training for the "real life". But it is important to distinguish between *teaching about* things and *rehearsing* for them. It is possible to know about the world without introducing its least lovely features into the school. There is ample place for the competitive ethic in the classroom. Teachers and students should be linked in a joint struggle against such common enemies as ignorance, self-hatred, and biogtry, and aginst the constraints -- limited time, resources, energy -- that postpone the victory against these adversaries. By the terms of this sort of competition, the instructor is a friend, a mature guide, and an ally to his pupils. Who, in the name of "realistic training" would permanently prefer the counter-image of teacher as paymaster?

We have no desire to make light of the problem of discontinuity of experience between the type of school we envision and the post-school years. The passage from a controlled moral climate to the chill winds of the competitive world would almost certainly entail difficult adjustments. It is conceivable that some might have distorted preconceptions and others may have developed trained incapacities to suceed in a system governed by a vastly different complex of ethical norms. One hopes that they could call upon the personality strengths acquired during the school years to ease the pain of transition and that as each graduating class introduces its values to the community, in due time the dramatic contrasts between school and society would be greatly reduced. Meanwhile, all other considerations aside, the entire youthful population would have reason for gratitude for twelve years of genuinely democratic existence.

Certainly, we do not wish to encourage the brand of realism which from the earliest years has been nourished by cynicism and distrust of society's institutions. It is difficult to escape the conviction that the system of competitive marking must make the school seem hypocritical to many students. The sequence starts with the school urging each child to do his best. Assume, then, that because of natural and trained differences in capacities, there is a widely varying set of performance outcomes -- some children do "very well", some do "fair", some do "very poorly". The schools then attach symbols -- marks and numbers -- to these performances and publicize them by report cards, by posting test scores, and other such procedures. The child who has been asked and has agreed to do the best he can, and scores "low" could not be blamed if he concludes that the school values him less than others. The teacher speaks of others as "excellent" or "good" while he is spoken of as "fair" or "poor" or "failing". But how do we justify punishing and publicly degrading a student for failing to achieve a level of performance which no one could reasonably have expected him to achieve in the first place? What justice is there in encouraging effort and then marking performance? Can one expect more than that of which a child is able? And if a child gives all that of which he is capable, is he not entitled to as full a range of the rewards and appreciation the school has to offer any any other child? To take any other stand is to revert to the position that it is fair and proper to reward the advantages of birth and of opportunity. For the differences in the performances of children are due either to the differences in their innate abilities or their advantages in life or both. And it is these differences, then, that we mark as excellent, good, fair, poor and failing.

This argument could be extended with some justice even to the matter of "effort". Children are not equal in motivation, energy, or social experience. There is an underlying logic in human exertions; people do not strive for goals when they have no hope of success. Many children have been systematically conditioned to failure by the time they arrive in school. His father toils but does not reap, or his younger brother is loved but he is not, or his friend can catch a ball but he cannot. Prior experience has taught him that any reliable connection between effort and achievement is at least questionable. We have no intention of confering moral immunity on children by pleading genetic or environment determinism on their behalf; even the very young may be legitimately required to exercise choice. However, it is the essence of good teaching to create the conditions to overcome past disabilities so that interests can be stimulated and energies can be engaged. We do this by demonstrating to the child that with proper will he can become what he has the power to be. To define success instead by what others are and he cannot be is to assure paralysis of the will.

The school probably stands, for children, as the main symbol of organized adult authority and of the attitudes of that adult society toward different kinds and classes of people. It is no accident then that so many lower class and "low ability" children come to feel and show genuine hatred for schools, for teachers, and for all they represent. For the school is the locus of their first major publicly symbolized failure and futility, as conveyed by the symbols of reward and degradation -- the grades and the promotions and the distinctions and the attention -- given out unequally to children. As Fritz Redl has put it, "The children who hate are the children who are hated".

It is our contention, in view of these problems, that no solution short of the abolition of competitive marks, the graded curriculum and the concepts of pass and fail will probably be adequate if we are to achieve equal, quality education for all.

The aims of the schools in this society, we contend, are to facilitate and create, to the extent possible, relevant skills of mind, meaningful attitudes, tastes, and values, and readinesses for democratic relationships and for effective citizenship. We can measure -- and we must measure -- how much schools and students achieve in this regard. But we cripple the ability of any school to operate effectively for all its students when we support and sponsor the invidious comparison of the "performance" of differently endowed and advantaged students against meaningless uniform standards. The measurement of how much schools and students are achieving along the path toward the desired goals of education is invaluable if we are to identify the combination of processes that yield more or less of the desired outcomes. Evaluation of outcomes is therefore incidental to the really crucial task of evaluation of process. We really wish to know how and why students change so that we may discover how we can help them to progress more rapidly in desirable directions. As matters now stand we confine ourselves to recording the level of his performance and hold the student responsible for the results. In so doing, we dispose of our responsibilities to make the educational processes more effective. We may thus salve our own consciences, but in the process we cripple our schools and embitter significant segments of our population.

There is then a powerful presumptive case against continuing the present practice of awarding competitive marks but we do not pretend that we have disposed of this issue. The counter-arguments are familiar and not without plausibility. It is said that marks serve as a potent extrinsic motivational device; that invidious distinctions by teachers and peers are inevitable with or without formal symbols that ratify them; that comparisons to other people are often useful to both the student and to parents, the next echelon of schooling, and prospective employers; that any scheme of evaluation will be recorded as a summary symbol that will necessarily resemble marks; that individuation is not feasible from the standpoint of administration and class management -- and the list could be extended.

To the extent that these arguments defend competitive marks, in principle, we reject them; to the degree that they point to instrumental problems, they must be overcome. It would be folly to abandon current practices until we could explore the consequences of proposed alternatives. But we shall not know until we try.

The intensification of research on evaluation and motivation and the widespread adoption of experimental designs that would provide further systematic examination of policies akin to those that we have suggested deserve high priorities on any agenda of educational needs. A number of schools have already begun to experiment with non-marking and ungraded cirricula. It is too early to describe or report any valid results. And much will depend on the extent to which the systems of higher education -- the colleges and universities -- will cooperate with elementary and high schools in making it possible for students from non-marking, ungraded curricula to seek and gain admission to college, on the basis of tests administered by the colleges themselves and without the information heretofore furnished by high school grades. In view of the way in which testing and grading and promoting and failing interfere with individuated education, it would seem sensible to begin such experimentation with non-marking and ungraded schools immediately and on a much wider scale than has yet been instituted.

The achievement of equal, quality education for all, therefore, requires certain fundamental changes in present-day school practices and processes, not the least of which is a receptivity and a willingness to experiment with new ideas. Some changes may be introduced immediately; others will require, as various conference papers observed, great amounts of new resources, new ideas, new personnel, and new arrangements relevant to educational process. There is yet a long way to go and very much to be done. It is time to begin. We have attempted to identify some of the obstacles to individuation and hence to equality which are subject at least to partial rectification immediately; stereotyping of students, testing and grading them into homogemeous ability groups, and invidiously punishing and rewarding their variable performances and publicly symbolizing their "honor" and "dishonor" in our eyes by our system of competetive marking, promotion, and failure.

The Prices and Profits of Quality and Equality

The specification of goals is only the first step in the achievement of equality and quality in education. An indispensable second step is the selection of appropriate means, a task that is always shaped by the fact that while our wants know no boundaries, our resources are finite.

All social action, therefore, involves "costs", in the sense that money, time, energy, and organization ingenuity that are allocated to one purpose are not available for others. The expenditure of funds for schools leaves less money for highways; the elevation of the "oppressed" to equal statues reduces the advantages of the "oppressors"; and the expenditure of motivational energy on behalf of education deflects it from other worthy social purposes.

The dilemmas of choice among competing goals may be reduced by either adding to the pool of resources or by establishing priorities. The first involves more effective utilization of existing facilities or the creation of new ones. The latter involves questions of 1) values, i.e. what outcomes do we most treasure?; 2) dimension, i.e. among which spheres of human activities -- economic, psychological, or social -- shall the resources be distributed?; 3) sequence, i.e. what shall we do first, second, third?; and, 4) burden, i.e. which sectors of society will be assessed the most in the payment of costs?

1. Values. What outcomes do we most treasure?

Professor Harris' discussion of the costs involved in providing certain extra amounts of education in the next decades indicates quite clearly that the issues of public policy are never exclusively instrumental; the process of choosing is necessarily based on explicit or implicit ideological assumptions. According to Harris:

> Even the $12 billion dollar estimates for 1) the disadvantaged at age 2 to 5, and 2) for raising standards of the less affluent states would consume eight per cent of the expected rise of GNP (as of 1970). . . I suspect that a goal of $2 billion of additional expenditures on education, or roughly seven per cent of the expected annual gain of GNP is a practical one, or possibly as much as 10 per cent of $3 billion if the federal government would become more active in this field . . . Here are the limits of a practical goal. The resources are there. The real question is, are we prepared to allocate eight per cent of GNP and 20 per cent of the rise of GNP from 1963 to 1970 on education? . . . Determinants of educational outlays are largely the methods of financing, the relative responsibilities of the different levels of government and the choice of alternative areas of spending. If (say) $1 billion additional revenue is to be had, should it be spent on educations, on housing, on health, on security, on jobs, or on what? 13

The point that requires emphasis is that the decision of how much is proper to spend on education for a society or any of its population segments is a value question involving choices among competing methods and interests. It is misleading to say, therefore, that the nation "cannot afford" more education at any given time. Any such verdict rests on a whole set of judgments as to what a society is prepared to give up to achieve the ends that it most cherishes.

We hold that education is crucial both for social and individual welfare and is simultaneously an investment and an item of consumption. It is thus a precondition for social stability and economic development as well as for personal fulfillment. These facts give education a general claim on budget priorities which is exceeded by no others. Moreover, as we have argued earlier, in a very real sense, all men are "educationally deprived". For while it is possible ot envision a world in which reasonable men would be content with their material conditions in life, it is unimaginable that they could legitimately claim that they knew as much as there was to know and as they could profit from.

In trying to anticipate the not-too-distant future, Professor Hook sees certain emerging requirements and goals of education that would radically alter the present decisions on education's proper share of the budget. He says:

> Our technological revolution . . . may in the future erode the necessity of earning alliving by making the brains of mediocre human beings vocationally obsolescent. The ageof automation and applied nuclear energy . . . may produce a world in which work becomes a privilege rather than a necessity . . . Now, the coming obsolescence of all but the managerial and inventive functions restores to a central place in schooling, it seems to me, the ideal of Greek liberal education. There ideals presupposed that free men are concerned with the pursuit and enjoyment of ends, of consummatory experiences and not with the means and instrumentalities which were relegated to the provenances

> of slaves. These ideals presupposed that the vocation of a free man is active citizenship, not earning a living . . . In a world which is genuinely a welfare economy . . . how can education help human beings to develop a center around which to organize their experiences so that they can live a rich and meaningful life? This is the ultimate issue and challenge . . . 14

While the prospects of which Professor Hook speaks are not tomorrow's, neither may they be dismissed as inconceivable. If we approached the Greek ideal of the vocation of a free man with any degree of seriousness, our schools would have to be altered in revolutionary ways, and it would be necessary to introduce corresponding changes in the allocation of national resources.

We have argued throughout this essay that all children are equally entitled to a high quality education and that it is inadmissible in any general sense to set upper limits on the proper amount of education. When we join the doctrines of "no upper limit" and "equal entitlement" we are, in fact, advocating a significant increase in both the absolute and relative levels of support for American education.

Now, some strongly contend that in fact increasing portions of our natural resources have, in fact, been devoted to education during the twentieth century. But Professor Harris reminds us that the 50-fold increase in public school expenditures, from 1900 to 1956, and the 13-fold increace in expenditures for higher education from 1929 to 1962 are not "equally impressive if the expenditures are deflated by relevant price and also adjusted to the basis of numbers being educated. Then we will find, as Hirsch did, that daily per pupil expenditures in stable dollars were virtually unchanged from 1906 to 1958, and in higher education the rise of outlays per students have not kept up with that in per capita income, that is to say, in relation to the rising standard of living, education has fallen behind." 15

Professor Harris surely understates the matter when he says the figures are not "equally impressive" when adjusted for relevant prices and for numbers of pupils educated. For the impression is widespread and the conviction is deep that our society has really altered its conception of the importance of education since the early 1900's and has given evidence of that altered conception by a much greater relative allocation of its resources on education.

Obviously, there are uneven profiles from community to community with regard to the decrease, stability, or increase of monetary investment in education. However, as Professor Harris indicates, although higher education has shown some gains, public school education, at least as measured by daily per pupil expenditure, has shown literally none.

The continuation of this pattern of support may seem prudent by some standards but not as measured against the certainty of serious social and personal deficits. The precise budgetary demands for education are ultimately determined by the interplay of three major variables: (1) the number of children enrolled in school, (2) the number of years per child, and (3) the level of quality of education per year per child. A substantial increase in any of these will require unprecedented expenditures of manpower, money, and intellectual energy. It is difficult to imagine alternative uses to which these resources could be placed which would better serve democratic values.

2. Dimension. Among which spheres of human activities -- economic, psychological, or social -- shall the costs be distributed?

There is a notable tendency to treat "costs" as if they were only economic and consisted exclusively of providing enough resources to the schools. It should be obvious, however, that economic measures must be sustained by extensive social and psychological change. It is manifestly unjust, for example, that a child in Mississippi should by virtue of the accident of birth receive a markedly inferior education in the name of "local control" of taxation. Clearly, equality among regions cannot be achieved without some intervention by the federal government, with a corresponding decline in the prerogatives of local officials. Similarly, we shall ultimately have to find some means of raising the financial level of support for children who now attend parochial schools without destroying the delicate fabric of church-state relationships which currently exists in the United States. Social considerations also intrude in the matter of making teaching sufficiently economically attractive to recruit high level talent. This cannot be accomplished without revising current notions of occupational prestige and the structure of the rewards available to those who work in the public rather than the private sector of the economy.

The importance of social and psychological factors does not rest only on their relevance for patterns of financial support. They are critical independent determinants of the learning process. They influence the extent to which children can be receptive to the message of the school, whether or not such messages are reinforced or extinguished, and the degree to which there is any consonance and continuity between school experiences and "real life."

As Robin Williams points out, a minimum effort to achieve equal educational opportunity involves the abolition of social discrimination, the improvement of poorer schools, the enrichment of community and home environments, and the expansion of job opportunities. Tasks of this scope would constitute a minor revolution in American life, but even more may be needed. The costs of furnishing quality education may include the necessity of devoting increasing attention to fundamental social values, the aesthetic climate, and patterns of private existence that impinge on the school. For instance, any effort to develop cultivated tastes in children is severely hampered by the competing attraction of the vulgarity and violence of the mass media. It is likewise difficult for a school to implement the goals that we have defined when students daily return to a world which emphasizes invidious distinctions of rank and reward. In the long run, equal quality education may entail basic changes in the ways in which we evaluate occupational and other performances in society at large. A truly democratic nation would, with equal gratitude, reward all of its citizens for good performance of all useful work.

It is imperative also that we find the means to rescue children from the psychological assault and emotional deprivation that afflicts many of them even before they enter school. Bronfenbrenner's treatment of these matters is confined to the Negro child, but his discussion has a wider portent. It is clear that any child who is reared in an impoverished family environment, who has been taught in a thousand subtle ways that he is inferior, and who even as he starts school already lags behind others in cognitive skills is not likely to realize his full potential as a student and human being.

A society does not dispatch its obligation to its school by even the most generous patterns of financial assistance. It must provide the climate in which children and learning can flourish. But these are costs that we should be content to incur, for in the process we redeem our own lives.

3. Sequence. What shall we do first, second, third?

The desire for educational reform is nourished by a mood of impatience with existing practices that adversely affect all sectors of the population -- the deprived and the affluent, the academically average and the gifted, the emotionally adequate and psychologically impoverished. We are, for instance, committed to the view that the first task of a free society is to complete the process of providing equal opportunity for first-rate schooling for all persons regardless of race, color, or creed. This item is properly at the very top of our agenda of educational needs. But it does not relieve us of the equal obligation to furnish quality education for the more fortunate children who attend schools in our more affluent localities. As we have indicated earlier, the one-sided emphasis on "getting ahead" with its reliance on extrinsic motivations and the accompanying denigration of non-cognitive learning is a severe disservice even to the more favored of our youth. Not the least of our trespasses against them is to teach them a system of values that creates a snobbish contempt for persons who are less intellectually gifted.

Our dedication, then, is to all children, since the neglect of any involves penalties that we would wish to avoid. At the same time, since it may not be possible to achieve everything at once, we are obliged to establish priorities of order. This task involves realistic judgments about what we wish to accomplish and also what can be achieved in any concrete situation. These problems require us to acknowledge the distinction between "ideal" and "actual" levels of aspiration. The first refers to ultimate desiderata of the sort that we have stressed throughout much of this essay. An example of such goals is "continuing education for everyone throughout the course of his entire lifetime." Actual goals refer to "realistic" aspirations which, while consonant in direction and quality with the ultimate ideals, are thought to be probably achievable in the proximate future, e.g. the extension of schooling for everyone for one additional year. The function of ideal goals is to indicate the final destination of our journey. The function of actual goals consists of deciding the sequence according to which we shall reach intermediate way-stations along the entire route.

This decision will, in turn, be affected by some assessment of the actual constellation of forces in society and involves a judicious balance between tactics and strategy. For example, we view both the reduction of class size and the abolition of competitive grading as indispensable ingredients of individuation and hence of quality. The first is conventionally recognized as desirable and in many communities presumably attainable, while the second may strike the average school board member as an offense against the natural order of things. In some instances, then, it may be prudent to separate the two demands, to refrain from pushing in one area in order to advance in another.

There is, however, a difference between the adoption of sensible goals and tactics and the flabby "realism" that serves as a rationale for inaction. Every delay, every compromise, every gesture of moderation, no matter how justifiable, postpones the final achievement of quality and equality in education.

4. Burden. Which sectors of society will be assessed the most in the payment of costs?

All change, including educational change, involves temporary dislocations which are disproportionately assumed by some sectors of the population. For example, any system of taxation designed to provide support of the schools should and presumably will assess higher income groups more than those less able to pay. Similarly, if all children become objects of equal concern to the school, the privileged few who may have heretofore virtually monopolized attention will presumably receive less attention. These are probably inevitable consequences that will be required to rectify past errors. However, as the papers of Williams and Bronfenbrenner make clear, all children bear some of the costs of initial efforts to achieve quality and equality in education.

Williams suggests that the

> integration of Negro and white children in the same school classes initially means at least a short-range increase in competition for the Negro children who come from economically, socially and culturally deprived backgrounds. This is likely to result initially in increased "strain" -- more specifically, in increased anxiety, fear, and suppressed resentment, and then, depending on other conditions, these responses may find social expression in processes of distorted communication and conflict. 16

Bronfenbrenner adds that "in many cases the Negro child in the integrated classroom is, and continues to be, intellectually retarded, unable to concentrate, unmotivated to learn; at first apathetic, but as he gets older, becoming resentful, rebellious, and delinquency-prone." The danger is that "unless countermeasures are introduced," these characteristics may "provide an objective basis and emotional provocation for devaluating and rejecting the Negro, thus reactivating and reinforcing the vicious circle of discrimination and defeat."

However, these consequences are not suffered by the Negro alone for, as Bronfenbrenner also indicates:

> The learning difficulties of the Negro pupil, if they are taken into consideration by the teacher, slow up the rest of the class. Similarly, disruptions by some impede teaching for all. Finally, while it is true that white children in an integrated classroom function as models for their Negro companions, the reverse process is equally in effect . . . In other words, the white child is likely to take on some of the aggressive and disruptive activities of his Negro classmates to the further detriment of his work in school. . . In short, in the integrated classroom, the problems of the Negro child become, at least in part, those of the white child as well. Thus the costs of inequality to the Negro become the costs of equality to the white. 17

There is no denying that the sins of the fathers are, in fact, visited upon the sons. The solution does not lie in the perpetuation of sin. The "countermeasures" to which Bronfenbrenner alludes include revision of teaching practices, allocation of additional resources, and increasing the sensitivity of teachers and parents. All of these may cushion the impact of transition.

One must, finally, consider the costs of not providing equal opportunity. For, it is all too evident that the continued commitment to the democratic ideals which our society affirms is always under danger of erosion from the inequalities in opportunities and situations experienced by significant percentages of our people. Yet, we are fortunate in that very few of our underprivileged people have ever sought solutions for themselves or their fellow men outside the institutional boundaries of our society. Rather, they have tended to act as though it were possible to open the doors of opportunity of this society sufficiently wide to provide more chances for themselves, or, at least, for their children, and they have traditionally seen the educational system as the main instrument by which such social and economic mobility is to be achieved. So long, then, as mobility within the system is seen as a real possibility, and is, in fact, realized often and visibly enough, those who are most relatively deprived by the actual workings of our social and economic system are likely to remain loyal to the society, seeking only to make those changes that will provide more ample opportunities for themselves and their children. In these lights, the provision of equal educational opportunity is a sine qua non of the political stability of our existing institutions and of their ability flexibly to adapt to demands for greater equality of participation in decisions and greater enjoyment of whatever good things of life this society has to offer.

It is crucial, too, that we take into account the burden of costs our society incurs from the pathologies that result from social and economic inequalities. Any rational social bookkeeping would thus have to counterpose to the costs of new educational opportunities those that are involved in welfare payments, aid to dependent children, the maintenance of ever-increasing police forces, court staffs, prisons and reformatories, unemployment insurance, and the multitude of other devices employed to reduce inequalities or to restrain the resort to deviant means by those who find the normal channels of opportunity blocked. This is not to mention the ever-mounting psychic

and social burdens of increased inter-group tension, hostility, and conflict.

Some of the measures required to provide greater equality and quality of education are admittedly temporary palliatives; others require more drastic revision of existing practices and institutional arrangements. But we, as a society, can only blame ourselves and our ancestors, collectively, for the perplexities that now beset us. And it seems only fair that those of us who have most profited from previous or existing inequities should shoulder a major share of the responsibilities and costs required to rectify historical and contemporary injustices.

FOOTNOTES

The general themes of the various papers presented at the Conference are indicated in the Introduction to this volume. However, it may be of help to the reader to recall the particular bearing of various of the papers on the issues raised in this essay as these issues arise.

[1] The theme paper by Harold Taylor (Session One) and the two responses by Sidney Hook and Martin Mayer address themselves to the general philosophical and social premises and issues involved in the concepts of "equality" and "quality" of education in a democracy. See, especially, Taylor's concern with the role of education in a mass democratic society; Hook's emphasis on "equality" of concern for each student's individuality and Mayer's knowledgeable evaluations of the disparity between current ideals and practices.

[2] Peter Rossi's paper (Session Two) considers in detail the consequences for democratic society of inequality in opportunity under varying social circumstances. He also provides a cogent analysis of the prices this society may have to pay for not providing equality of educational opportunity.

[3] J. H. Powell's paper (Session Seven) on continuing education and its role in democratic life argues the need for education beyond the twelfth year, and reveals how much "adult education" of diverse sorts actually is going on presently. Louis Hacker's thesis supports the general outlines of Powell's argument but differs, often sharply, in the general philosophical grounds that support the argument. By contrast, van den Haag's paper expresses much greater reservation about the utility of continuing education for all, even going so far as to argue the "disability" of such education for some circumstances.

[4] These educational goals or functions are fundamentally similar to those adopted by the Committee on Quality Education of the Council of Basic Education of the Pennsylvania State Board of Education. This committee, under the chairmanship of Mrs. Elizabeth Greenfield, was charged by the Pennsylvania State Legislature to devise a plan for the measurement of quality education throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. In

conjunction with the Educational Testing Service, a series of goals was formulated. The design of the measurement of the achievement of these goals became the core of the program of evaluation of quality education now under way in Pennsylvania.

[5] Edgar Friedenberg's paper (Session Five) considers the alternative kinds of "adjustment" the schools might aim at and raises serious questions concerning the tendency to use the schools to perpetuate a "middle class" culture. Samuel Shepard's response runs directly counter to the Friedenberg thesis in its explicit avowal of the desirability of using the schools to bring disadvantaged children, especially Negroes, into familiarity and ease with middle class standards, conduct, and academic performance.

[6] See Boris Ford's trenchant comments (in Session Six, Additional Queries and Comments) on the aspirations embodied in the new educational developments in Britain.

[7] Martin Deutsch (Session Two), one of the leading figures in "pre-school" training in the United States, presents a carefully reasoned analysis, based on substantial data, about the ways in which emotional or affective components in the school experience interact with cognitive capacities to shape cognitive performance.

[8] See, particularly, Miriam Goldberg's cautions (Session Five) about existing desires for "identifying" and "testing" talents and abilities and her grave concerns for the lowered horizons of possibilities adopted by teachers on the basis of inadequate evidence.

[9] Clarence Senior and Herman Long's comments on John Flanagan's paper (Session Four) reveal the wide range of pressures, both within and outside the classroom, that often operate to shape educational decisions of local school boards.

[10] Fritz Redl and Milton Schwebel, in their comments on Samuel Kirk's paper (Session Three), explore ranges of problems connected with grouping, tracking and streaming, that are not usually encountered in discussions of these topics. Redl reminds us that the question of the advisability of "grouping" must always be considered in light of the intended outcome and of the known

variability in the group in question, so that any rational decision has to consider how much "variability" and of what kind can be handled effectively in the given circumstances.

[11] We do not consider problems of teacher training here in any greater detail than other specific problems such as curriculum construction. But these problems are gone into at considerable length and with much wisdom by Robert Schaefer in his paper on teacher training, and this paper is much enriched by the comments of Judson Shaplin and Theodore Sizer.

[12] See especially in this regard the incisive evaluation of the available research by both Kirk and Goldberg, particularly regarding the great variability in the outcomes of studies of groupings.

[13] See Harris' paper on economic costs, page 3 to 7.

[14] See Sidney Hook's discussion of Harold Taylor's paper, Session One.

[15] See Harris' paper on economic costs, page 7.

[16] See Williams' paper on social costs, page 20.

[17] See Bronfenbrenner's paper on psychological costs, page 8.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

I POLARITIES AND TENSIONS IN THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

Barzun, Jacques, The House of Intellect. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. 276 pages

The author argues that art, science, and philanthropy are destroyers of intellect: "the intellectual class has been captivated by art, overawed by science, and seduced by philanthropy." The basic atrophy of intellectual life and the failures of the schools to cultivate intellect are discussed, and fundamental changes, not only in education, but in the conditions of intellectual life, are demanded. "The business of learning must, above all, be represented in its true guise as difficult, as demanding effort."

Bereday, George Z.F. and Lauwerys, J.A., editors, 1961 Yearbook of Education: Concepts of Excellence in Education. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1961. 499 pages

The papers in this collection deal with philosophical and social aspects of "excellence" in world perspective, showing how the varying definitions and concerns for the development of talent are incorporated into total school patterns. Different concepts of "excellence" are first explored and related to historical and social contexts. The second section is devoted to inquiry into the institutional arrangements made to develop excellence and to train talent. This comparative approach emphasizes that notions of excellence and talent are not independent of time and place.

Bestor, Arthur, Jr., The Restoration of Learning. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955. 459 pages

Building upon some of his earlier ideas in Educational Wastelands, Professor Bestor describes the kind of education he thinks essential for America in the mid-twentieth century. He contends that present educational policy and practice reflect "the insidious argment that schools and colleges, to be democratic, must lower their intellectual standards and water down their curricula." Attacking the "anti-intellectual philosophy of the leading educationists", he calls for a rise in intellectual standards and pursuits in the schools. Proposals for action are presented.

Blanshard, Brand, editor, Education in the Age of Science. New York: Basic Books, 1959. 302 pages

This book is the product of a symposium of educators and critics who gathered to discuss American educational problems. The major portion of the volume consists of four sets of papers and excerpts from discussions and debates. Topics considered are: "What is education?"

"Education and the American scene", "Education and the world scene", and "Science and the humanities". Five additional relevant essays have also been included.

Conant, James B., The American High School Today. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959. 140 pages

Amidst much criticism of American schools, Dr. Conant raises a positive voice, emphasizing that comprehensive schools can provide good and appropriate education for all in a democratic environment. Characteristics of comprehensive schools are discussed first, followed by a series of recommendations for improvements in curriculum and school organization. The author argues that American secondary education can be made satisfactory without any radical changes in the basic pattern, given sufficient interest and support by the citizenry.

Counts, George S., Education and American Civilization. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952. 491 pages

The heritage, values, and current challenges and changes in American life are examined and related to education. Contending that the new American way of life must rest upon a new synthesis of values, the author sketches the dimensions of changes that must be made in the schools. The type of educational program and curriculum needed to "develop individual excellence, preserve the principles of equality and political liberty, achieve an economy of security and plenty, and support an enduring world civilization of beauty and grandeur" is described.

Cremin, Lawrence A., The Transformation of the School. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961. 387 pages

The history of the progressive education movement from 1876 to 1957 is traced. Progressive education, Professor Cremin argues, began and grew as part of a vast humanitarian effort. "The word 'progressive' provides the clue to what it really was: the educational phase of American Progressivism writ large". The origins, heyday, and demise of the movement are treated as part of the social and intellectual history of the era. The theories, programs, and practices of progressive educators, those who allied themselves with the movement, and the criticisms of the movement, are assessed.

Gardner, John W., Excellence: Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too? New York:
Harper & Brothers, 1961. 171 pages

This is a cogent analysis of the relation between equality and excellence in education in the United States. The author explores the conditions under which excellence is possible in our society, the kinds of equality that can and must be honored, and the kinds that cannot be forced. The present-day "dilemma" is documented; the question of "standards" is treated; and directions to be taken are suggested. It is argued that the tension in our society between attention to individual performance and restraints on individual performance will never be resolved and never should be, for such tension is necessary in a democracy.

Hook, Sidney, Education for Modern Man: A New Perspective. New York:
Alfred A. Knopf, 1963. 235 pages

Professor Hook outlines a modern philosophy of education and examines some of the major challenges that have been hurled at current educational practices. Criticizing the inadequacy of the "two cultures" approach, he offers a proposal for the successful integration of not only the scientific and humanistic traditions but the social science and historical disciplines as well. The author applies his principles to the practical solution of specific problems facing educators, administrators, and parents. The aims, content, methods, and materials of education are considered in answering the question of what constitutes a liberal education in modern times.

Kimball, Solon T., and McClellan, James E. Jr., Education and the New America.
New York: Random House, 1962. 402 pages

The unique character of American life and education are examined and analyzed from the combined perspectives of anthropology and philosophy of education. Two facts about American life are of the utmost importance in understanding the newly emerging culture: the order and energy of American life, and the increasingly problematical nature of individual commitment. The authors contend that the schools are doing what needs to be done to keep the social system operating, but they are not teaching young men and women to understand and possibly control the society of which they are a part. Basic changes in curriculum and methods are suggested.

Lieberman, Myron, The Future of Public Education. Chicago: University of
Chicago Press, 1960. 294 pages

This is a trenchant critique of contemporary education. Much of the debate about the schools, it is suggested, is irrelevant, since it ignores any analysis of the anachronistic and dysfunctional power structure within which educational policies are made. The author calls for a technological, professional, economic, and managerial revolution in our educational system, and advances some specific proposals for reform.

Rickover, H.G., Education and Freedom. New York: Dutton, 1959. 256 pages

Admiral Rickover contends that "the school's concern is with the intellect alone", and criticizes contemporary American education as being more concerned with social adjustment than with creative brainpower. He calls for a solid liberal arts program in the schools to train the minds of the talented. "Those who do not have the mentality to master all the liberal arts subjects" he argues "need the same kind of intellectual fare, only less of it."

Woodring, Paul, A Fourth of a Nation. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1957. 255 pages

Recent conflicts in educational policy are outlined and assessed. The author suggests that resolution of these debates need not depend upon the acceptance of one or two diametrically opposed viewpoints. Rather, he calls for a synthesis of ideas from the classical and progressive views, providing us with a new philosophy of education. A reorganization of the structure of education, the training of teachers, etc., is then derived from the synthesis.

II EDUCATION IN THE SOCIAL SYSTEM: EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL INFLUENCES AFFECTING THE SCHOOL

Coleman, James Samuel, The Adolescent Society. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961. 337 pages

The common characteristics of adolescent culture and varying school and community characteristics are presented on the basis of data from questionnaires and interviews with students, parents, and teachers in ten schools. The author explores such topics as how adolescent status systems in various schools differ in the kinds and number of activities which confer status on a boy or girl, and the variations between systems where status is gained primarily by achievement and those where status is ascribed on the basis of some background characteristic, such as a family's position in the community. Ways of utilizing the values of the adolescent society in the interests of broader educational goals are suggested.

Dahlke, H. Otto, Values in Culture and Classroom. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958. 557 pages

Values and actions, their institutional expression, and the consequent social relations, provide the frame of reference in which the American school is examined. On the assumption, "if this type of value orientation, then this type of school", attention is first directed to values in American life and institutional groups, and then to the sociocultural context of the schools. The school as an institutional group -- its structure and organization, activities, rules, regulations, and values -- the school as a center of controversy, and the informal organization and system of evaluation that structures relations within the school, are explored and analyzed.

Dexter, Lewis Anthony, The Tyranny of Schooling. New York: Basic Books, 1964. 182 pages

This is a polemic against the present structure of compulsory education in the United States. The author argues that our society teaches contempt for stupidity through compulsory schooling and auxiliary practices such as ability grouping. The school system, he maintains, has created mechanisms for differentiating the mediocre from the stupid and has made children feel it is far more shameful to be intellectually subnormal than to violate most other social expectations or demands. The nature of a different kind of school system is indicated.

Friedenberg, Edgar Z., Coming of Age in America: Growth and Acquiescence. New York: Random House, 1963. 300 pages

This is a study of student values as they affect the choices students make in school situations and as they are expressed in attitudes toward school and the possibilities it affords. The author and his colleagues, in a study of adolescents and secondary schools, were interested in "how students would face the choice between support for excellence or distinction and a more general extension of opportunity to less well qualified but needier candidates; between well-roundedness and devotion to special talents and immediate personal commitments; between privacy and inwardness and effective socialization in the interests of the welfare of the group". The author argues that secondary schools in America oblige the student to internalize the authority of the school, so that those who resist tend to drop out or be rejected by the system.

Goodman, Paul, Growing Up Absurd. New York: Random House, 1956. 296 pages

Two subjects are brought together: "the disgrace of the Organized System of semimonopolies, government, advertisers, etc., and the disaffection of the growing generation." Professor Goodman argues that the young need a more worthwhile world in order to grow up at all, and contrasts this with the world that they have been getting. What is needed, then, to solve the "Youth Problem", is not a change in techniques of socializing, but changes in our society and culture. The frustrations and dilemmas of work, play, sex, the family, the community, and the larger society are explored.

Halsey, A. H. and Floud, Jean and Anderson, C. Arnold, Education, Economy, and Society. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961. 620 pages

This reader in the sociology of education includes comparative and illustrative material drawn from the American experience. Educators, economists, and sociologists deal with the impact of economic and social change on educational requirements, the influence of social factors on educational achievement, and the changing social functions of teachers and institutions. The selections focus on the connection between education and the economy in industrialized countries, especially on the role that schools and universities play in selecting and training manpower. The collection illustrates how "the traditional business of education with the cultural transmission is performed in quite new terms under the new conditions of technological society."

Havighurst, Robert J. and Neugarten, Bernice L., *Society and Education*, Second edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1962. 579 pages

The society and the child growing up in the society are examined from a sociological point of view. The educational system is examined in terms of what are said to be its two essential functions: (1) interpreting and transmitting the values of society and inducting the child into his society; and (2) improving the society by promoting the ideals of the society and helping children make their maximum contributions to the community. Social structure, the school in the social structure and in the community, and the teacher, are the major foci of discussion.

Henry, Jules, *Culture Against Man*. New York: Random House, 1963. 495 pages

The interconnections among American institutions, values, and character are examined in terms of theories of social and psychological organization. In assessing the behavior of our teen-agers, the conduct of our family lives, the role of advertising, the process of education, and the care of the aged, Professor Henry argues that two themes are dominant. Our "lopsided preoccupation with amassing wealth and raising our standard of living", and an "obsessive fear of annihilation by a foreign power" dominate our lives and desiccate our values. To avoid embroiling children in the adult nightmare of the drive for success and the accompanying fear of failure, educators must emphasize quite opposite themes.

Mayer, Martin, *The Schools*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961. 478 pages

This is a serious journalistic account of the schools based upon reading, visiting, and interviewing in the United States and parts of Western Europe. In the first section, the author establishes the background against which the different schools and their programs may be placed. The child is then followed, both chronologically and in key subject areas, through the normal program of the public schools. These descriptive materials provide the content for an abstract discussion of critical issues.

Raywid, Mary Anne, *The Ax-Grinders*. New York: Macmillan & Co., 1962. 260 pages

This is an investigation of some of the recent efforts to discredit the public schools. The analysis is based upon the responses of 83 organizations and individuals and deals with personalities, sources of financial support, methods, collaboration, and power of the "ultra-right wing political and economic radicals."

Riesman, David, Constraint and Variety in American Education. Garden City: Anchor Books, 1958. 174 pages

Three lectures on the character of American schools and colleges place our education in its cultural context. The first lecture deals with academic institutions -- the best, mediocre, and worst colleges and universities -- in relation to each other. The author raises such problems as "institutional homogenization": "the way in which universities come to resemble large corporations or government agencies, markedly so in seeing public relations as the answer to all dilemmas." The second lecture deals with the fields of knowledge (primarily within the social sciences) and their relation to each other. In the final lecture, Professor Riesman presents a theory of "counter-cyclical" education, that is, education should oppose momentary booms and busts in our cultural economy.

Sexton, Patricia C., Education and Income: Inequalities of Opportunity in our Public Schools. New York: Viking Press, 1961. 293 pages

Evidence gathered in a study of a large urban public school system is presented to show that our public school system has rejected its role of facilitating social mobility, and has become, instead, an instrument of prevailing social and economic class distinctions. The underprivileged and the culturally deprived are presently handicapped; not only do they come from homes which have not prepared them for school, but they have inferior teachers, less adequate school facilities, and substantially fewer opportunities to advance academically or socially.

III THE CHALLENGE OF GROUP DIFFERENCES

Brookover, Wilbur B., Paterson, Ann, and Thomas, Shailer, Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement. East Lansing, Michigan: Office of Research and Publications, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1962. 105 pages

Data were gathered from 1,050 seventh grade students in junior high schools to test hypotheses regarding the relationships between IQ, school achievement, and the student's self-concept of himself as a school learner. A significant relationship between self-concept of ability and school achievement was found, leading to the hypothesis that systematic changes in self-concept of ability would lead to changes in achievement.

Clark, Kenneth B., Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power. New York: Harper and Row, 1965. 240 pages

Using Harlem as the symbol of the dark ghetto, Dr. Clark analyzes the Negro power structure -- political, religious, economic, intellectual -- and dissects the effectiveness and ineffectiveness of civil rights strategies. There are profiles of a number of leaders, an interpretation of the psychology of the ghetto and of the ambivalent relationship between the Negro and the white liberal. Other topics include the deterioration of the human resources of the ghetto, the decline in the IQ's of Negro children the longer they stay in school, and the pattern of pathology -- broken homes, illegitimacy, delinquency, drug addiction, and homicide. It is suggested that in the final analysis, the dark ghetto reflects the "deeper torment and anguish of the total human predicament."

Davis, Allison, Social Class Influences upon Learning. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955. 100 pages

This is a concise description of the basic socialization of the human character and intellect, as this social learning is developed in middle-class culture and in lower-class (or slum) culture. The author considers: (1) the nature of social classes in this country; (2) the effect of social-class culture in differentiating the basic early training of children; (3) the cultural definition by each social class of what is pleasant and desirable, and of what is unpleasant and dangerous; (4) the influence of the social-class environment in defining those types of intellectual problems which are regarded as important by children of each social class, and in teaching skills for solving such problems; and (5) the effects of social-class culture upon teachers and curricula.

Deutsch, Martin, Minority Group and Class Status as Related to Social and Personality Factors in Scholastic Achievement. Monograph # 2. Ithaca: Society for Applied Anthropology, 1960. 32 pages

This is a report of the findings of a three-year research study conducted in a major northern city and centered in the schools and community of a large encapsulated all-Negro area. The purpose of the study was to investigate (1) the interrelationships among the social environment, class, ethnic, and racial factors, and specific aspects of intra-group behavior and personality in a population of children; and (2) the implications of this for learning and for scholastic achievement in the school, the organization of the school to meet the needs of these children, and the attitudes and values of the teachers in working with and stimulating these children. Dr. Deutsch points out ways in which the school not only fails to foster a positive self-image, but often reinforces the child's anxieties and negative self-image.

Giles, H. Harry, The Integrated Classroom. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1959. 332 pages

Using empirical data from schools throughout the country, the problems of integrating within the classroom varying racial, religious, national, and socio-economic groups are discussed in terms of the general theory of social conflict. The human factors that operate in the integrated classroom are analyzed as a prelude to the question of how such diversity can be handled to create harmonious working groups. The discussion of teaching aids for promoting better intergroup relations and greater understanding is followed by a list of resources: publications, films, organizations, and consultants.

Goodlad, John I. and Anderson, Robert H., The Nongraded Elementary School. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1963 (revised edition). 244 pages

In this volume, the authors argue against "the anachronistic nature" of ungraded school structure and many of the practices that inevitably accompany it. They propose and describe an alternative: "a nongraded structure and a variety of more enlightened school practices that are related to the absence of grades and lock-step." The arguments derive from a belief that the realities of child development defy the rigorous ordering of children's abilities and attainments into conventional graded structure. Empirical data on child development, achievement, results obtained with both graded and nongraded structure, etc. are presented; a comprehensive bibliography on individual differences and pupil grouping, promotion policies and practices, reporting to parents, and nongraded school organization is appended.

Harrington, Michael, The Other America: Poverty in the United States. New York: Macmillan Company, 1962. 191 pages

The "other America" is a land of the poor: "the unskilled workers, the migrant farm workers, the aged, the minorities, and all the others who live in the underworld of American life." This is a description of the world of "the failures, those driven from the land and bewildered by the city, the old people suddenly confronted with the torments of loneliness and poverty, and the minorities facing a wall of prejudice." The author documents the psychic and material dimensions and costs of poverty, and concludes that contemporary poverty is a self-perpetuating culture that can be overthrown only by an integrated and comprehensive program.

Henry, N.B., editor, The Dynamics of Instructional Groups. The 59th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960. 280 pages

The efforts of the yearbook committee have been directed at (a) providing an exposition of the sociopsychological knowledge about human groups which is relevant to the operation of instructional groups, and (b) developing the connections between this knowledge and the pressing problems of instructional practice. Two introductory chapters reveal the dimensions of the problem: the first identifies and discusses the problem of "individual" and "group" as a social issue in American society and education; the other contains an analysis of the sociopsychological aspects of the teacher's role as they relate to instructional action. The major portion of the volume is devoted to various aspects of classroom groups as social systems; development of membership, norms, and leadership within the group; and diagnosis and guidance of instructional groups.

Hoffman, Banesh, The Tyranny of Testing. New York: Collier Books, 1964. 217 pages

This is a searing indictment of "objective" tests and a warning that they are blocking our search for superior talent in the schools, the business community, and in the nation itself. These tests, it is argued, "reward superficiality, ignore creativity, and penalize the person with a probing, subtle mind." Testing in school and elsewhere thus does the opposite of what is hoped. Numerous examples are cited in support of this thesis to dispel the "awe of professionalism" of the testers.

Lichter, Solomon, Rapien, Elsie B., Seibert, Frances M., Sklansky, Morris, The Drop-Outs. New York: The Free Press, 1962. 294 pages

This book reports the findings of a three-year treatment study of a group of intellectually capable Chicago youngsters who wanted to leave or who left school. The authors examine the emotional problems and difficulties at home that were the primary reasons for dropping out of school. The usefulness of prolonged counseling is illustrated by empirical data and case studies. Methods of recognizing, diagnosing, and dealing with such difficulties are suggested.

National Education Association, Educational Policies Commission, Education and the Disadvantaged American. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1962. 39 pages

"Cultural incompatibility and educational inadequacy are not new phenomena, nor are they more repugnant to American morality today than in the past. But mobility has brought the problem to the fore and has made its solution more urgent", this pamphlet argues. A short summery of the inadequacy of the schools in providing for the "culturally disadvantaged" is followed by suggestions of ways in which policies and practices should be altered. Public policy and special characteristics of school program, staff, administration, facilities, and relationships with home and community are discussed.

Passow, A. Harry, editor, Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, Bureau of Publications, 1963. 359 pages

Most of the chapters in this book were originally presented as papers at a conference called to explore the dimensions of education in depressed urban areas and to develop guiding principles for program planners. The authors -- behavioral and social scientists -- reported relevant research, theoretical assumptions, and implications for educational planners. There are analyses of the unique characteristics and roles of the school in the urban setting and in urban development, the nature of existing and required instructional procedures, the characteristics of personnel and material resources, and selected other aspects of the problems faced by schools in depressed urban areas.

Riessman, Frank, The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962. 129 pages

The purpose of this book is "to challenge the widely-held notion that the 'culturally deprived' child is not interested in education, and to present a new 'cultural' approach for teaching these children." Acknowledging that factors in the non-school environment do much to explain the culturally deprived child's failure in school, the author contends that more emphasis must be put upon the school's contribution to failure. The cleavage between the deprived child and the school, it is suggested, can be lessened only if educators attempt to understand the psychology and culture of the child. The book presents insights into various aspects of the culture of the underprivileged and shows how these are related to the child's school career.

Thelen, Herbert A. (or Chicago University, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences), Teachability Grouping. Chicago: Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1961. 236 pages and appendices

The volume reports the findings of a research study of the rationale, methods, and results of "teacher-facilitative grouping". The principles of student selection were examined with a wide variety of instruments. The authors contend that "in the present state of the art the concept of dividing students into objectively definable types presents formidable difficulties. And that even if it could be done, the problem of deducing from existing curriculum theory what ought to be done is also a formidable one." Teachability grouping, on the other hand, rests on the assumptions that the particular "personalities" in the group are important factors which have a great deal of influence over the nature and productivity of classroom experience, and consequently that grouping must in some way attempt to "fit" students and teachers together. Considerable detailed information -- research methods, case studies, findings, and suggestions -- is given.

Wrightstone, J. Wayne, Class Organization for Instruction. Washington,D.C.: American Educational Research Association of the National Education Association, 1957. 33 pages

This pamphlet is one of the series "What Research Says to the Teacher". Research on the effects of various types of grouping is summarized and suggestions are made for applications of these findings. The author concludes that groupings within the class are the best method for providing individualized instruction on the elementary school level.

IV THE CHALLENGE OF INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

Bereday, George Z.F. and Lauwerys, J.A., *1962 Yearbook of Education: The Gifted Child*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1962. 538 pages

Following the previous yearbook on philosophical and social aspects of excellence, the present volume emphasizes the psychological aspects of the education of the talented. Sections on "Psychological Theories", "Detection of Ability and Selection for Educational Purposes", and "Increasing the Pool of Talent" present the thinking and practice in various countries of the world. Differing definitions of "intelligence" or "intellectual ability" are related to the dialogue about general intelligence as against special faculty intelligence, modes of measurement and selection, the programming of subject matter, etc. The problems of prediction of success after schooling, and the implications of special education for the gifted are also discussed.

Bloom, Benjamin S., *Stability and Change in Human Characteristics*. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1964. 231 pages

This book represents an attempt to identify "stable" characteristics, to describe the extent to which such characteristics are stabilized at various ages, and to determine the conditions under which these characteristics may be modified. Those characteristics taken as "stable" includk physical characteristics, intelligence, academic achievement, generalized qualities of interests, and deep-seated personality characteristics. In general, the findings indicate the tremendous importance of the first few years of life for all that follows, as change in many characteristics becomes more and more difficult with increasing age. The theoretical and practical consequences for child-rearing and education are considered.

Dunn, Lloyd M., editor, *Exceptional Children in the Schools*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1963. 555 pages

Exceptional children and the specialized school programs they need are discussed by the seven contributors to this volume. Definitions, prevalence, identification, characteristics, educational procedures, and resources concerning both handicapped and gifted children are presented. An introductory chapter presents an overview of special education and its clientele. Adjustment is treated in terms of both theory and practice in the concluding chapter.

Flanagan, John C.; Dailey, John T.; Shaycroft, Marion; Orr, David B. and Goldberg, Isadore, Project Talent: A Survey and Follow-Up Study of Educational Plans and Decisions in Relation to Aptitude Patterns: Studies of the American High School. Pittsburgh: Project Talent Office, University of Pittsburgh, 1962.

This monograph contains a detailed report of the first results of Project Talent's findings about American high schools. The characteristics of a sample of 1,353 American secondary schools are related to measured outcomes of the achievement and performance of the graduates of these schools. Characteristics of guidance and counseling programs, and their results, are analyzed, and ways in which these can be designed to better serve the students are suggested.

Getzels, J.W. and Jackson, P.W., Creativity and Intelligence. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1962. 277 pages

The authors challenge the common assumption that performance on standardized intelligence tests is highly correlated with the "elusive human quality of creativity". Children high in creativity and low in IQ are compared with children who score in the opposite direction on these measures. The authors show that these children differ significantly with respect to personal values, imaginative productions, career goals, and family background.

Haring, Norris G; Stern, George G.; Cruikshank, William M., Attitudes of Educators toward Exceptional Children. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1958. 238 pages

As there is greater movement toward the integration of exceptional children into regular grades in the public schools, the authors felt a need for examination of the attitudes of teachers toward these children. The sample consisted of a group of teachers and administrators engaged in workshop sessions. Attitudes and knowledge concerning children who are mentally retarded, acoustically, visually or physically handicapped, emotionally disturbed, academically retarded, and intellectually superior, were investigated. The book includes an examination of the extent to which such attitudes could be modified and the effect of increased acceptance upon teacher-child relationships.

Hunt, J. McV., Intelligence and Experience. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1961. 393 pages

Evidence from various sources has led to a transformation in the traditional conception of fixed intelligence and predetermined development; recognition is now being given to the crucial role of life experience. The author discusses investigations of learning situations, problem solving, and programming of computers, to show how the human brain is "programmed" in the course of the experiences of living. Implications for education and child-rearing are developed. A lengthy bibliography is appended.

Johnson, G. Orville, *Education for the Slow Learners*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963

"In many instances, the slow learners are a broader and more complex sociological problem than they are often considered to be by many educators. Community agencies other than the schools must help the slow learner." Arguing that the school must clearly define its own role and also engage the cooperation of other agencies, the author delineates the problems presented by slow learners and suggests ways in which school organization and instruction can be designed to solve them. Diagnosis, evaluation, grading, and promotion of slow learners are also discussed. The principles underlying the author's approach and proposals are set forth in a concluding, summary chapter.

Kephart, N., *The Slow Learner in the Classroom*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Book Co., Inc., 1960. 288 pages

In three major sections, the book deals with (1) the principal learning areas in the development of the pre-school child; (2) a series of performances by means of which the teacher may assess the child's level of basic learning skills; and (3) methods by which basic pre-readiness skills can be taught. The discussion is focussed on the age groups from kindergarten through the first three grades on the assumption that the training task is easier and the problems less complicated in the early school years.

Kirk, Samuel A., *Educating Exceptional Children*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1962. 415 pages

This book deals with the characteristics and problems of various kinds of exceptional children, and the types of educational provision made for them. The concept of "split growth" or "discrepancies in growth" is emphasized. Federal, state, and local services, and programs for the preparation of teachers of special education are assessed.

National Society for the Study of Education, Individualizing Instruction. The 61st Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962. 327 pages

Certain issues dealing with individual differences and various proposals for providing for them in the schools are outlined in this yearbook. The writers deal with broad issues and general principles rather than with specific proposals for each subject field at each grade level. The major emphases are: biological, social and educational forces related to the origin and development of variation; selected evidence about human variability; practices intended to provide for individual differences; and implications for teacher education and for the community.

Passow, A. Harry, et. al., Planning for Talented Youth: Considerations for Public Schools. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1955. 84 pages

This pamphlet asserts that "the present demand for more widespread discovery and development of talented individuals emphasizes the fact that our great national effort to provide educational opportunities for all youth has created serious deficiencies in provisions for students with outstanding abilities." Topics treated include identification, administrative adaptations, instructional procedures, guidance services, community resources, and evaluation of a program for the talented.

V THE CONTENT AND PROCESSES OF EDUCATION

Ahmann, J. Stanley and Glock, Marvin D., Evaluating Pupil Growth. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1959. 605 pages

This is essentially a text for the elementary or secondary school teacher on how to appraise the results of teaching. The introductory section deals with the theory of evaluation and measurement, and with the role of evaluation in education. The second section is concerned with the validity, reliability, and the use of test scores and norms. The major portion of the volume is concerned with various types of instruments and techniques for assessing all phases of pupil growth.

Bloom, Benjamin S., et. al., Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, New York: Longman's Green, 1956. 207 pages

A taxonomy of educational objectives -- a requisite of communication between educators -- is presented in two sections: I "The Cognitive Domain", and II "The Affective Domain". The former includes those objectives which deal with the recall or recognition of knowledge and the development of intellectual abilities and skills. For each of the categories there is (1) a definition of the category; (2) illustrative objectives; (3) a discussion of problems and considerations in testing objectives in the category; and (4) examples of items testing objectives in the category. Part II, "The Affective Domain", includes objectives which describe changes in interest, attitudes, and values, and the development of appreciations and adequate adjustment. The format is similar to the first part.

Bruner, Jerome, The Process of Education. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1960. 92 pages

Professor Bruner discusses the question, "What shall we teach and to what end?" in the light of the pioneering experiments in teaching that have been taking place across the nation for the past five years. He concludes that the basic concepts of science and the humanities can be grasped by children far earlier than has been thought possible. The task is to present the fundamental structure of the material in a form that can first be apprehended intuitively by the child, and then later, through instruction, to build upon this intuitive understanding. The ideas of "structure" and "intuition" and their relation to intellectual development are examined from a psychological point of view and from the practical standpoint of devising a curriculum.

Faunce, Roland C. and Bossing, Nelson L., *Developing the Core Curriculum*. Second edition. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958. 373 pages

The "core" idea, based upon the concept of experience learning, "seeks to draw upon a wide range of information, sources, materials, and appropriate activities necessary to the solution of vital problems of personal and social concern. Whatever in the total environment will contribute to the solution of these problems is considered 'grist for the mill' by the alert, discerning teacher. It involves a complete disregard of existing subject matter lines or subject matter emphases." The first five chapters present the definition and underlying educational bases of the core curriculum. The remaining chapters are devoted to the implementation of the core curriculum within the community, the school, and the classroom; practical suggestions and illustrations are offered.

Heath, Robert W., *New Curricula*. New York: Harper and Row, 1964. 284 pages

One purpose of this book is to provide a description of the goals, history, and status of several key curriculum projects in the words of people closely associated with their direction. A second purpose is to gather together discussions of the implications of these courses for a variety of educational issues. The papers are said to illustrate the "new reform movement" away from "progressive education" to "more emphasis on the development of the intellect." Reforms in mathematics and science receive the most attention.

Lawler, Marcella R., *Curriculum Consultants at Work: Factors Affecting Their Success*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958. 207 pages

This is a study of the work of several curriculum consultants in different schools, over a two-year period. The author gives special attention to the problems of how to work with individuals and groups in curriculum study and how to establish and maintain a curriculum study. Four problem areas are identified and discussed: problem definition, favorable group climate, consultant's methods of work, and the role of central office personnel.

McNally, Harold J. and Passow, A. Harry, editors, *Improving the Quality of Public School Programs: Approaches to Curriculum Development*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1960. 321 pages

In the first four chapters the author-editors discuss the social changes and forces which demand curriculum modification, administrative and organizational considerations, the nature of curriculum improvement processes, and procedures used in curriculum development programs. These chapters present a general framework within which the succeeding chapters may be assessed. These later sections present detailed features of school systems that vary in size, organization, and geographic setting. Each gives attention to program objectives, means of initiation, organization, procedures, and personnel involved. The concluding chapter presents guidelines formulated from the seven program descriptions.

Miles, Matthew B., editor, Innovation in Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964. 689 pages

Numerous contributors deal with the nature and process of educational innovation. Topics include: the extent of current innovational activities in American education, available data on the acceleration of change rates, possible causative factors, the planning and execution of change processes, characteristics of innovative persons and groups, phases of the innovational process, and other related questions. It is concluded that evaluation of the actual efficacy of educational innovations is extremely difficult; the criteria for failure and success are reviewed.

Passow, A. Harry, Curriculum Crossroads. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962. 123 pages

The publication includes nine presentations and position papers from a conference on curriculum. The speakers were asked to examine a frontier area and to take a view which might be considered extreme in order to crystallize concepts. Each paper is followed by a summary of the questions and answers it provoked. Considerable attention is devoted to the avenues and obstacles to curricular reform -- the politics of change, the dynamics of change, and the problem of defining the structure of the curriculum as it exists or is projected.

Rosenbloom, Paul C., editor, Modern Viewpoints in the Curriculum. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1964. 303 pages

Developments in every academic field, the scientific problems in educational experimentation, the activities of professional societies, foundations, and government agencies, and problems facing Congress are discussed in this symposium. There is a strong argument for revision of traditional ideas about readiness in light of recent experiments. Rather, it is proposed, there must be a "general attempt to teach a coherent pattern rather than isolated bits of knowledge." In a supplementary section, curriculum projects supported by various agencies are listed and described, proposals are set forth for national mechanisms for curriculum research and development (both governmental and non-governmental), state level activities are described, and pending legislation is noted.

Thorndike, Robert L. and Hagen, Elizabeth, Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education. Second edition. New York, Wiley & Sons, 1961. 602 pages

This is designed as an introductory text. Theoretical bases of testing are presented; the limitations of tests as well as their usefulness is discussed; the importance of the tester's examining his own purposes and objectives, as well as examining the tests, is stressed. Chapter titles include: "The Teacher's Own Tests", "Where to Find Information about Specific Tests", "Standardized Tests of Intelligence or Scholastic Aptitude", "Achievement Tests", "Questionnaires and Inventories for Self-Appraisal". The reader is introduced to elementary statistical concepts, norms, and units for measurement.

VI THE RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING OF SCHOOLMEN

Ayars, Albert L., *Administering the People's Schools*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1957. 356 pages

This is a book on the responsibilities of the school superintendent with some attention given to the duties of the school principal and school board members. Designed primarily for the administrator, it is also planned "as an aid to prospective superintendents and principals, teachers, parents, board members, and other citizens who need to understand and participate in the task of administering the schools." The nature and responsibilities of the board, the staff, and the students, and the superintendent's relations with these people, is assessed. The role of the superintendent as the "head of an industry" is discussed in terms of the budget, buying supplies and equipment, providing insurance, providing services, planning, and maintaining buildings. His responsibilities as an educator are seen to include curriculum improvement, in-service development, administration of special curriculum services, evaluation of school practices and personnel, and maintainence of the freedom to teach and learn.

Bereday, George Z.F. and Lauwerys, Joseph A., *The Education and Training of Teachers: The Yearbook of Education, 1963*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963. 574 pages

Four inter-related themes are analysed for the study of the topic. First, conceptions of the "ideal teacher" in ancient and influential civilizations, and contemporary modifications of these stereotypes by educational reformers and teacher training institutions, are assessed. The second theme, the ways in which teachers are at present educated and trained, is presented by means of descriptions and analyses of institutional arrangements in representative countries. The status of the profession and the feelings teachers themselves have about their place in society are discussed in the section concerned with the relation between teacher training and various economic and social problems. Finally, a number of studies of significant new developments which are taking place or are planned in the area of teacher education are included. The contributions from educators from many countries offer comparative perspective on the topic.

Biddle, Bruce J. and Ellena, William J., editors, *Contemporary Research and Teacher Effectiveness*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964. 342 pages

Research approaches to the problem of teacher effectiveness are summarized in a series of papers directed to educators, lay persons, and especially to present or prospective educational researchers. The nature and complexity of the problem are delineated, and new programs of research on the process of instruction and the physical and social contexts in which education is performed are described. The emphasis throughout is on how to study effectiveness as a phenomenon, with concepts appropriate to that task, with methods, and with research strategy. Among the factors considered are teacher personality,and behavior, interaction, analysis of role, and communication in the classroom.

Callahan, Raymond E., *Education and the Cult of Efficiency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962. 264 pages

The role of the school administrator is illustrated in terms of the author's thesis that "very much of what has happened in American education since 1900 can be explained on the basis of the extreme vulnerability of our schoolmen to public criticism and pressure and that this vulnerability is built into our pattern of local support and control." Administrators, he suggests, are forced to respond to all sorts of public demands, though such a method of operation does not necessarily result in "meeting the needs of the community" and often results in an abdication of responsibility for educational leadership. The relevance of different types of training of school administrators is discussed.

Conant, James Bryant, *The Education of American Teachers*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963. 270 pages

Basic questions and assumptions underlying the controversy around teacher education are examined: Who is responsible for the education of teachers? Who ought to be responsible? How well do state regulations protect the public against ignorant and incompetent teachers? How much freedom should be given to institutions preparing teachers? Dr. Conant suggests some answers as a result of his study of certification policies and teacher-training programs. Arguing that some of the diversity resulting from local controls and varying programs must be preserved, he suggests avenues of reform to bring about greater uniformity where this is needed. The major focus is on the relation of the state to teacher education and certification, and it is in these areas that the author proposes basic changes.

Gage, N. L., Handbook of Research of Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963. 1,172 pages

The purpose of this handbook is to bring research on teaching into more fruitful contact with the behavioral sciences. The framework specifies three major classes of variables: "central variables", "relevant variables", and "site" variables." Included in the first is research in three categories: (1) teaching methods, (2) instruments and media of teaching, and (3) the teacher's personality and characteristics. Two loci in which relevant variables cluster are: (1) social interaction in the classroom, and (2) the social background of teaching. The categories of site variables considered are (1) grade level, and (2) subject matter. In addition to the substantive problems and findings, something of the historical, philosophical, and theoretical background about methodology are included.

Hodenfield, G. K and Stinnett, T.M.,, The Education of Teachers. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961. 175 pages

This book is a summary of three national conferences on teacher education and professional standards. Mr. Hodenfield, education writer for the Associated Press, reports on the controversies in historical perspective and as they are presently being debated. Various dimensions of the discussions on the needs of teachers, curriculum programs, institutional planning, and certification are presented in lay terms for the general public. The co-author, T. M. Stinnett, has provided technical notes and data for students and technicians in education.

Koerner, James, The Miseducation of American Teachers. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963. 350 pages

Dr. Koerner delivers a polemic on the inadequacy of our modes of teacher preparation, decrying the low quality of education provided in teachers colleges, colleges, and universities. He contends, among other things, that: academic subjects are being neglected; there is administrative inertia; "education" courses are puerile, dull, and too numerous; both faculty and students in education programs tend to be of poorer academic caliber than might be desired; graduate programs for administrators and special school personnel are deficient; etc. The data derive from a two-year study entailing review of the available literature and visits to 63 regionally accredited institutions of all types and sizes.

McKenna, Bernard H., Staffing the Schools. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965. 120 pages

Some of the insights that have come out of the qualitative analyses of staff and the implications that these studies have for staff recruitment and in-service training are discussed. Focus is upon the interrelation between staff policies and school quality. The sub-title identifies the main questions with which the book deals: "How many professionals are needed?" "How should they be deployed?" "What should be their characteristics?" Problems of class size, use of non-professionals, status factors, etc. are also treated.

National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Changes in Teacher Education: An Appraisal. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1964. 523 pages

This volume is the official report of the Eighteenth T.E.P.S. Conference. The first phase directs attention to the current social and educational setting and the circumstances which make changes in teacher education imperative. Case studies provide a sampling of current changes; illustrations are given to test the criteria for appraising change. A wide range of examples from varying types of institutions is provided. Alternative curricula and approaches, recruitment of prospective teachers, in-service training programs, special programs (e.g. for teachers in slum schools), and new media of instruction are some of the topics treated in the 45 case studies.

Ryans, David G., Characteristics of Teachers: Their Description, Comparison, and Appraisal. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960. 410 pages

"In spite of the recognition and lip service accorded good teaching, relatively little reliable information is available regarding its nature and the teacher characteristics which contribute to it." This detailed research study is designed to begin filling this gap. Dr. Ryans identifies certain types of teacher behavior and pupil behavior, surveys teacher activities, preferences, attitudes, and viewpoints, and compares various defined groups of teachers (elementary vs. secondary, married vs. unmarried, etc.). Some explorations are made to relate these characteristics to effectiveness of teaching, but it is noted that the qualities of good teachers are not absolutes; they are, rather, interacting traits that vary in their merits, depending upon educational philosophy, pupil characteristics, course level and content, and other factors.

VII BEYOND THE TWELFTH YEAR: THE PROBLEM OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

Association for Higher Education, Current Issues in Higher Education 1964: Undergraduate Education. The Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Conference on Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1964. 271 pages

Major issues are summarized in the 72 abbreviated conference papers in this volume. Sections are headed as follows: "Values -- Past and Future", "The Future of Liberal Arts", "Turbulence Among Students", "Changing Trends in College Teaching", "Curriculum Models in Particular Disciplines", and "Institutional Planning and Purposes". Running through most of the papers is the dominant theme of The Student: who is he? what does he want and need? how can he be reached? what are his rights and responsibilities? how does he become the Educated Man?

Brunner, Edmund de S.; Wilder, David S.; Kirchner, Corinne; and Newberry, John S., Jr., An Overview of Adult Education Research. Chicago: Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., 1959. 273 pages

Research in non-vocational adult education was reviewed to produce sufficient generalizations for a theory upon which policy might be based. A major part of the volume is devoted to matters pertaining to the educatee, such as learning, interests, participation, and motivation. A second major section is devoted to matters pertaining to the educator: organization, program building, methods and techniques, and the role of groups in adult education. A final section is concerned with education, chiefly in terms of evaluation. Suggestions concerning needed research are included in each chapter.

Clark, Harold F., and Sloan, Harold S., Classrooms in the Factories. Rutherford, New Jersey: Institute of Research, Fairleigh Dickinson University, 1960. 139 pages

This report deals with the educational activities of approximately 500 leading industrial corporations. By "education" is meant a definite program in which knowledge or skills are taught according to some predetermined plan, with periodic group meetings, required assignments and examinations, or some comparable means of judging achievement. The report reviews the origin of corporation educational activities, surveys their extent and nature, and analyzes the subject matter with which they deal. The authors suggest that it can presently be said that "a new sector is being added to the traditional pattern of American public and private education."

Clark, Harold F. and Sloan, Harold S., Classrooms in the Military. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964. 154 pages

The Armed Forces educational program is presented as "one manifestation of a universal trend -- the overflow of education into non-academic channels -- society's response to a technological age." The Authors see the program as "a vast complex, integrated with the entire intellectual life of the nation, and making significant contributions of its own . . . an incessant series of shifts, changes, and revisions, kaleidoscopic in their variety and rapidity." They present the overall pattern of education in the Armed Forces of the United States, with examples of methods and practices.

David, Henry, editor, Education and Manpower. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960. 326 pages

The bearing of national manpower needs on educational policy is explored in terms of historical background and contemporary issues. Educational m aterials from four previous National Manpower Council publications have been brought together in four major sections: general theory, secondary education, vocational guidance, and higher education. The relationships between education and occupational choices of youth, the skills of the labor force, patterns of mobility and utilization, the significance of work for men and women, and public and private policies affecting the nation's manpower resources are discussed. No "easy" formulae for the most effective utilization of talent and meeting of manpower needs are presented, rather, it is stressed that definite and final solutions do not exist.

Davis, James A., Great Books and Small Groups. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961. 230 pages

This is a detailed study of factors which tend to retain members within on-going liberal education programs. The central focus is the extent to which the retention process can be assigned to individual factors (the characteristics of people as individuals which affect their continuation) and how much may be due to group characteristics. The data come from a national sample of almost 2,000 Great Books program participants. Some of the factors found to be important for retention were roles taken within the group, social interaction between members outside the group, intellectual and ideological variables, and religious and political affiliations.

Knowles, Malcolm S., The Adult Education Movement in the United States. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1962. 316 pages

Professor Knowles traces the role adult education has played in the development of a national culture from colonial days to the present, shows how the forces in our society have influenced education, and comments on possible future trends. The contributions and goals of various organizations involved in adult education are discussed along with the present day needs for a coordinated, continuous program. The use of the word "movement", the author suggests, "brings together into a definable social system all the individuals, institutions, and associations concerned with the education of adults and portrays them as working toward such common goals as the improvement of the methods and materials of adult learning, the extension of opportunities for adults to learn, and the advancement of the general level of our culture."

National Association of Public School Adult Educators, Public School Adult Education: A Guide for Administrators. Revised edition. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Public School Adult Educators, 1963. 199 pages

This book deals with concepts and elements of public school adult education and with administrative programs, practices, and responsibilities. "Adult educators in a public school setting must still face a number of unresolved issues. There are still differences of philosophy or objectives, of financial support, of scope of curricula, of acceptance, to name a few." The papers are designed to aid in the solution of these problems. Specific action is suggested for planning, building, and maintaining a dynamic program.

Powell, John W., Learning Comes of Age, New York: Association Press, 1956. 235 pages

The provision of planned learning for the mature years is treated through analyses of aims, agencies, areas, and structure. Dr. Powell describes what is going on in the field of adult education, the needs of the adult, and the significant trends toward better provision for these needs. He defines and discusses such issues as "the need for a fully adult method and subject matter, for a stable institutional form, for a recognizable profession, for a new art of combining multiple agencies, organizations and volunteer citizens into a comprehensive educational pattern."

Powell, John Walker, *Research in Adult Group Learning in the Liberal Arts*. White Plains, New York: The Fund for Adult Education, 1960. 13 pages

This pamphlet is a digest of and introduction to three studies of the kinds and levels of learning that take place in informal groups of adult education, and one historical and analytical account of a discussion project. The materials reviewed are: Abbott Kaplan, *Study-Discussion in the Liberal Arts* (1956); James A. Davis and Associates, *A Study of Participants in the Great Books Program*, (1957); Richard J. Hill, *A Comparative Study of Lecture and Discussion Methods* (1958); and Glen Burch, *Accent on Learning*. All are published by the Fund for Adult Education.

Rudolph, Frederick, *The American College and University: A History*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962. 516 pages

Dr. Rudolph charts the currents and cross-currents which have marked the development of higher education since 1636. Developments on campus are related to concurrent events in American thought and politics. Among the topics considered are : denominationalism and the spirit of scientific inquiry; the classical course and the elective system; college as an exercise in self-indulgence and college as a training for social usefulness; private and federal support; the old professors and the new vocations; the changing relationships among president, trustees, faculty and students; and the displacement of the oldtime professor and the simple arts college by academic man and the "organization" institution.

Sanford, Nevitt, editor, *The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of the Higher Learning*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962. 1,047 pages

The role and performance of higher education in America are subjected to analysis by numerous social scientists. Social and psychological theory is applied to various aspects of the college experience; empirical information from recent research studies is also presented. The college as a social institution with its own "culture" is investigated by several contributors. Considerable attention is also devoted to the social context of higher education, academic procedures, the lasting effects of college education, and the student: his motivations, development, successes and failures, values, and relations with peers and college staff.

Schramm, Wilbur; Lyle, Jack; and Pool, Ithiel de Sola, The People Look at Educational Television. Stanford University Press, 1963. 206 pages

Based on more than 30,000 interviews conducted among the audiences of nine representative educational stations in all sections of the country, this report presents a comprehensive picture of the present status of American non-commercial educational television. It answers such questions as "How big is the audience?" "Who is in the audience?" "What programs do they view?" "Why do they view?" "What do they think of educational television?" The authors conclude that the impact has been solid and significant if not as great as had been anticipated by the founders. The significance of the findings and the potential audience and uses are assessed.